Bibliometrics Analysis Report

A bibliometric analysis of tourists' experience and happiness in tourism (2000-2024)

Author1   Chungil Chae* (corresponding author)

Wed, 26 February 2025

Ver1.0

Overview of the Report

Bibliometrics

Overview

Main Information

gt::gt(MainInfo)

Description

- **Timespan and Growth**:
  - The dataset spans from **1992 to 2025** with an **annual growth rate of 12.59%**.

  - There are **1553 documents** contributing to this dataset.

- **Document Metrics**:
  - **Average citations per document** is **30.05**, indicating a relatively high citation impact.

  - **Document Average Age** is **4.37 years**, suggesting many publications are relatively recent.

  - A total of **70,323 references** were cited across all documents.

- **Keywords**:
  - **Keywords Plus (ID)** total **2269**, while **Author's Keywords (DE)** total **4512**.

25 – This indicates a broad range of topical coverage and suggests authors employ a wide variety of
26   terms to describe their work.

27 • **Authors and Collaboration**:

28   – There are **3258 authors** in total. Of these, **146** are authors of single-authored documents, and
29   there are **160 single-authored documents**.

30
31   – The average **Co-Authors per Document** is **3.02**, showing moderate teamwork on publications.

32
33   – **39.73%** of the documents involve **international co-authorship**, highlighting a significant level
34   of global collaboration.

35 • **Document Types**:

36   – The majority are **articles (1359)**, followed by:
37   ∗ **article; early access**: 124

38
39   ∗ **review**: 60

40
41   ∗ **review; early access**: 6

42
43   ∗ Smaller numbers for proceedings papers, editorial material, and one retracted publication.

44 **Interpretation**

45 • The **robust annual growth rate (12.59%)** from 1992 to 2025 reflects an expanding research area,
46   with increasing numbers of publications.

47
48 • The relatively **young average age (4.37 years)** of the documents implies that the field is actively
49   publishing new studies or is experiencing a surge of recent interest.

50
51 • A **high average citation rate (30.05)** points to the significance or influence of these studies,
52   indicating that the research outputs are resonating within the scholarly community.

53
54 • The **large number of references (70,323)** suggests that authors are building upon extensive prior
55   knowledge, indicative of a well-established research base.

56
57 • **Collaboration** metrics:

58   – An average of **3.02 co-authors per document** indicates moderate teamwork among researchers.

59
60   – **39.73% international co-authorship** underscores a noteworthy global dimension to this
61   research area, suggesting both the relevance and collaborative nature of the topic.

62
63 • The **predominance of articles** shows that the main mode of dissemination is through empirical or
64   theoretical research papers, while the presence of **reviews** (66 in total) indicates ongoing efforts to
65   synthesize existing knowledge.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, these findings reveal a **dynamically growing field** with a **steady increase** in publications over the past few decades. **High citation averages** and a **diverse, global collaborative network** underscore the field's academic importance. The dominance of **articles** among document types and the variety in **keywords** highlight broad research engagement and topical exploration.

In summary, the field demonstrates strong growth, collaborative spirit, and robust impact in terms of citation—signaling a vibrant and evolving scholarly community.

Annual Scientific Production

Description

- **Gradual Emergence (1992–2005)**:
  The number of articles is very low in the early years, ranging from 0 to 2 per year, with a small uptick to 5 in 2006.

- **Steady Uptick (2006–2015)**:
  From 2006 onward, there is a gradual climb in publications:

    - 5 articles in 2006

    - 10 articles by 2010

    - 29 articles by 2015

- **Significant Surge (2016–2024)**:
  The publication count shows a substantial rise during this period:

    - 53 articles in 2016

    - 98 in 2019

    - 142 in 2020

    - 191 in 2022

    - 342 in 2024

- **Partial Data or Drop in 2025**:
  After a record high in 2024 (342 articles), the count is **50** in 2025, which might indicate data for 2025 is **incomplete** or still being collected.

Interpretation

- **Growing Research Interest**:
  The rise from single-digit publications in the early 2000s to over 300 in 2024 highlights increasing global interest and research efforts in this field or topic.

- **Accelerating Publication Rate**:
  The jump from 2015 to 2024 suggests not just incremental growth but an accelerating pace of output, possibly due to:

  - Increased funding or recognition of the field's importance

  - More collaborative networks and open-access channels

  - Ongoing technological or theoretical breakthroughs leading to higher publication productivity

- **Fluctuation in Latest Year (2025)**:
  The sharp decline to 50 articles in 2025 likely reflects partial data for the year. If the pattern holds, the final count for 2025 may approach or exceed previous totals once data collection is complete.

Conclusion & Summary

In summary, the **annual scientific production** has shown a marked **upward trajectory** over the past decades, reflecting growing engagement and collaboration in this research area. The lower 2025 figure is likely due to incomplete data rather than a genuine downturn. Overall, the trend underscores a **maturing field** with **increasing scholarly attention** and output.

gt::gt(AnnualSciProd)

(data/figure/AnnualSciProd.png)

Average Citations per Year

Description

- **Mean Total Citations per Article (MeanTCperArt)**:

  - Higher values appear in earlier years (e.g., **178** in 1996, **195** in 2004), while more recent years show much lower values (e.g., **3.13** in 2024, **1.44** in 2025).

  - This reflects the **longer timespan** older articles have had to accumulate citations.

- **Number of Articles (N)**:

  - Sparse in the early years (often **1** or **2** articles).

  - **Substantial increase** in later years, with **342** articles in 2024 and **50** in 2025 (notable jump compared to single digits in the 1990s).

- **Mean Citations per Year (MeanTCperYear)**:

– Fluctuates from **2.88** (1992) to peaks around **8.86** (2004) and **8.14** (2011).

– Generally, older articles show higher mean citations per year, likely indicating influential or foundational research.

- **Citable Years**:

  – The table shows a **gradually decreasing number** of citable years as the publication date moves closer to the present (e.g., **34** citable years for 1992 vs. **1** for 2025).

  – This aligns with the notion that newer articles simply haven't had as much time to be cited.

Interpretation

- **Influence of Older Publications**:
  Articles from the 1990s and early 2000s show high average citations, suggesting they may be **seminal works** or foundational studies that have consistently been cited over decades.

- **Citation Accumulation Over Time**:
  The **longer an article has been available**, the more citations it tends to accumulate. Hence, recent publications (especially post-2020) naturally exhibit lower citation counts and lower mean citation rates.

- **Rapid Growth of Publications**:
  A **significant increase** in the number of articles in the 2010s and early 2020s indicates **expanding research activity**. More scholars entering the field and greater research funding can lead to a higher volume of new work, though these new papers typically need time to garner citations.

- **Disparities in Citation Rates**:
  Some specific years (e.g., 1996, 2004) show unusually high average citations, possibly indicating **particularly influential articles** published in those years.

Conclusion & Summary

In summary, **older publications have accrued more citations** and thus show higher average totals and yearly citation rates. Meanwhile, the **volume of recent publications** has grown substantially, but these newer papers have had **less time to gather citations**. Consequently, the dataset shows a **maturing field** where both the **quantity of research** and the **range of citation impacts** continue to expand.

gt::gt(AnnualCitPerYear)

(data/figure/AnnualCitPerYear.png)

165 **Sources**

166 **Most Relevant Sources**

167 **Description**

168 • **Top 5 Sources**:

169 1. **Tourism Management** leads with **108** articles.

171 2. **Journal of Travel Research** (97)

173 3. **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** (96)

175 4. **Current Issues in Tourism** (90)

177 5. **Annals of Tourism Research** (73)

178 • **Next Tier of Journals**:

179 – **International Journal of Tourism Research** (69), **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Man-**
180 **agement** (55), **Tourism Management Perspectives** (51), **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism**
181 **Research** (49), and **International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management** (46)
182 also feature prominently.

183 • **Moderate Contribution**:

184 – A range of journals contribute between **10 and 40 articles**, such as **Journal of Destination**
185 **Marketing & Management** (42) and **Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing** (41).

187 – Several niche or regionally focused journals (e.g., **Anatolia-International Journal of Tourism**
188 **and Hospitality Research**, **Tourism and Hospitality Research**) have counts in the teens or
189 single digits.

190 • **Long Tail of Sources**:

191 – Many journals have **fewer than 10 articles**. These include specialized outlets (e.g., **Journal of**
192 **Ecotourism**, **Tourist Studies**) and multidisciplinary journals that occasionally cover tourism
193 themes (e.g., **European Sport Management Quarterly**, **Sport in Society**).

195 – A handful of publications feature only **1 or 2** articles, likely representing specialized or newer
196 outlets.

197 **Interpretation**

198 • **Dominance of Core Tourism Journals**:
199 The **top five** clearly include **major tourism research outlets**, underscoring their leadership and high
200 visibility in the field. Their prominence indicates that they are **go-to journals** for scholars seeking to
201 disseminate influential work.

- **Diverse Publication Platforms**:
  The broad spread of journals, from dedicated tourism/hospitality outlets to interdisciplinary publications (e.g., **International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching**, **Sport Management Review**), reflects the **multidisciplinary nature** of tourism research. Scholars engage with tourism in relation to **hospitality, recreation, heritage, and sports**, indicating cross-field collaboration.

- **Global and Niche Perspectives**:
  Journals such as **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research** highlight **regional focuses**, while others (e.g., **Tourism Geographies**, **Tourist Studies**) emphasize specific thematic or methodological lenses. This diversity shows the field's richness and its multiple research avenues.

- **Emerging or Specialized Outlets**:
  Outlets with **fewer articles** likely represent **emerging journals**, specialized niches, or newly indexed publications. They can still be influential within particular subfields or geographic contexts.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, **Tourism Management**, **Journal of Travel Research**, and **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** head the list, illustrating their central roles in the dissemination of tourism scholarship. The breadth of titles confirms the **multidisciplinary, global scope** of research in tourism and hospitality, encompassing both highly specialized and more general outlets.

In summary, these data underscore the core journals that carry the bulk of tourism research output, as well as the growing ecosystem of **specialized or interdisciplinary publications** contributing to the field.

Most Local Cited Sources

Description

- **Top-Tier Citations**:

  – **Tourism Management** (TOURISM MANAGE) tops the list with **7,488** local citations, followed by

  – **Annals of Tourism Research** (ANN TOURISM RES) with **7,041**,

  – **Journal of Travel Research** entries combined (abbreviated as J TRAVEL RES = 3,793 and spelled out as JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH = 1,589) total over **5,300** citations if considered together,

  – **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** also appears twice (J SUSTAIN TOUR = 2,411 and JOURNAL OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM = 423), suggesting a large overall impact.

- **Key Tourism and Hospitality Outlets**:
  Besides the highest-cited titles above, other influential journals include **Current Issues in Tourism** (CURR ISSUES TOUR = 1,709), **International Journal of Hospitality Management** (1,682), **International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management** (1,311), and **Tourism Management Perspectives** (1,088).

- **Interdisciplinary and Methodological Sources**:
  Noteworthy entries from broader disciplines include:

    – **Journal of Business Research (1,152)**

    – **Social Indicators Research (726)**

    – **Psychological Bulletin (519)**

    – **Multivariate Data Analysis: A Global Perspective (240)**

    – **Structural Equation Modeling (115)**

    – **Science (107)**
      These highlight cross-disciplinary influences and methodological underpinnings within tourism research.

- **Diverse Topic Coverage**:
  Several other psychology or marketing journals, like **Journal of Consumer Research**, **Journal of Applied Psychology**, and **Journal of Marketing**, each exceed 400 local citations. There is also representation from **sustainability** (Sustainability-Basel, 971; Ecological Economics, 155), indicating an environmental focus within tourism research.

- **Overlap in Abbreviated vs. Full Journal Titles**:
  Some journals appear under both abbreviated and full titles (e.g., **J TRAVEL RES** and **JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH**), artificially splitting their total citations.

Interpretation

1. **Central Role of Specialized Tourism Journals**:

    - The dominance of **Tourism Management** and **Annals of Tourism Research** confirms their status as **leading authorities** in tourism scholarship.

    - When combined, different listings for **Journal of Travel Research** and **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** confirm they also command high local citations, placing them squarely among the discipline's core references.

2. **Significance of Interdisciplinary Support**:

    - The presence of **business, psychology, and sustainability** journals (e.g., Journal of Business Research, Psychological Bulletin, Sustainability-Basel) underscores the **multidisciplinary nature** of tourism studies.

    - Researchers frequently draw on marketing and psychological theories, as well as sustainability frameworks, to inform tourism-based inquiries.

3. **Methodological Foundation**:

- Citations to **Multivariate Data Analysis** and **Structural Equation Modeling** reflect that **quantitative, rigorous statistical approaches** are widely employed in tourism research, emphasizing sophisticated analysis techniques.

4. **Possibility of Citation Inflation via Duplicate Entries**:

  - Some journals (e.g., J TRAVEL RES vs. JOURNAL OF TRAVEL RESEARCH) appear twice, indicating that aggregated citations would be higher if merged.

  - This duplication suggests that authors may cite the same source using different abbreviations, reflecting standard inconsistencies in bibliographic data.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, **Tourism Management**, **Annals of Tourism Research**, and **Journal of Travel Research** (in both abbreviated and full forms) are at the forefront, reflecting their longstanding influence. The dataset also shows a **broad interdisciplinary reach**, with high citation counts for psychology, business, and sustainability journals. Further, the usage of advanced research methods is evident, pointing to a **mature and methodologically robust** field.

In summary, these citation patterns underscore the **central role of leading tourism journals**, the **cross-disciplinary integrations** shaping the field, and the **methodological depth** that tourism scholars employ in their research.

#| message: false #| warning: false #| paged-print: true library(dplyr) gt::gt(MostLocCitSources %>% filter(Articles >= 100))

(data/figure/MostLocCitSources.png)

Bradford's Law

Description

- **Zonal Distribution**: According to Bradford's Law, the journals are divided into three zones:

  - **Zone 1 (Core)**: Ranks 1–6, where each journal has the highest frequency of articles.

  - **Zone 2**: Ranks 7–19, which collectively contribute the next significant portion of articles.

  - **Zone 3**: Ranks 20–92, comprising the largest set of journals but each contributing fewer articles individually.

- **Zone 1 Journals (Ranks 1–6)**

  1. Tourism Management (108 articles)

  2. Journal of Travel Research (97)

3. Journal of Sustainable Tourism (96)

4. Current Issues in Tourism (90)

5. Annals of Tourism Research (73)

6. International Journal of Tourism Research (69)

Together, they have a **cumulative frequency** of **533** articles. This comparatively small group accounts for a large share of the total documents, reflecting their high impact and centrality in the field.

• **Zone 2 Journals (Ranks 7–19)**

– Includes journals such as *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management* (55 articles), *Tourism Management Perspectives* (51), and *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research* (49).

– Their cumulative frequency extends from **588** up to **1043**, indicating they collectively represent another substantial fraction of the total publications.

• **Zone 3 Journals (Ranks 20–92)**

– Contains the majority of the listed journals (from *Journal of Vacation Marketing* at rank 20 to *Sport Business and Management* at rank 92).

– Each source contributes fewer articles, but in aggregate they form the largest zone, reflecting the breadth and diversity of niche or emerging outlets in tourism and hospitality research.

Interpretation

1. **Clear Core Group**:
Zone 1 journals (the top six) are widely recognized as **key outlets** in tourism research. Their high article frequencies signify their **central role** in disseminating foundational and cutting-edge studies.

2. **Secondary But Still Significant Contributors**:
Zone 2 journals each have notable publication counts, reinforcing their status as important, although slightly less central, **publication avenues**. They often cater to particular subfields or combine tourism with other related disciplines (e.g., hospitality, recreation, or destination management).

3. **Long Tail in Zone 3**:
The largest cluster includes many specialized or regional journals. While each has fewer publications, collectively they offer **diverse perspectives and niche contributions** to the field. This distribution aligns with Bradford's Law, showing how research output is concentrated in a small number of core sources, with a wide array of additional journals making smaller but collectively significant contributions.

Conclusion & Summary

By applying Bradford's Law, we see a **high concentration of articles in a small group of journals** (Zone 1), followed by a moderately sized set (Zone 2), and a broad "long tail" (Zone 3).

352 **In summary**, the data confirm that a **few core journals** (Tourism Management, Journal of Travel Research,
353 Journal of Sustainable Tourism, etc.) dominate the field, while many other journals contribute essential but
354 more specialized insights. This distribution reflects a **mature academic domain** in which recognized flag-
355 ship journals coexist alongside numerous specialized outlets, together shaping the multi-faceted landscape
356 of tourism and hospitality scholarship.

357 gt::gt(BradfordLaw)

(data/figure/BradfordLaw.png)

Sources' Local Impact

Description

1. **High-impact Leaders**

   - **Tourism Management** (h-index = 54) stands out with the highest h-index, followed by **Annals of Tourism Research** (40) and **Journal of Travel Research** (40).

   - The g-index values follow a similar pattern, with **Tourism Management** (g = 98), **Annals of Tourism Research** (73), and **Journal of Travel Research** (74) at the forefront.

2. **Total Citations (TC) and Number of Publications (NP)**

   - **Tourism Management** again tops the list with **9,706 total citations** across **108 publications**, reflecting both **volume** and **influence**.

   - **Annals of Tourism Research** (TC = 6,712; NP = 73) and **Journal of Travel Research** (TC = 5,595; NP = 97) also show high visibility and citation impact.

3. **m-index (Years Normalized)**

   - **Tourism Management** and **Journal of Travel Research** share a high m-index of **2.35**, indicating that even when controlling for how long they've been publishing in this dataset (PY_start), they maintain strong citation momentum year over year.

   - **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** (m = 1.89) also exhibits a robust rate of accumulating citations since 2008.

4. **Emerging or Specialized Journals**

   - Many journals further down the list have lower h-index and g-index scores (e.g., h-index < 10). Some have relatively high m-index values despite lower absolute citation counts, indicating **rapid growth** within fewer years of publication history (e.g., *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, h=18, m=1.8, started in 2016).

Interpretation

- **Core Influence of Established Titles**:
  The highest h-index and g-index values cluster around **long-standing, flagship tourism journals**, confirming their role as **core venues** where influential and widely cited research is published.

- **Role of Publication Timeline**:
  The **m-index** (which normalizes the h-index by publication years) reveals that **newer outlets** can still accumulate citations rapidly if they publish high-impact studies. For example, *Tourism Management Perspectives* (m = 2.09, started in 2015) has gained traction quickly, suggesting it's an emerging high-impact venue.

- **Breadth of Field Maturity**:
  Journals with moderate or low h-index/g-index but strong niche focus (e.g., *Information Technology & Tourism*) indicate the **specialized sub-areas** within tourism scholarship. They may have fewer articles overall but still contribute valuable, specialized insights.

- **Influence of Journal Age**:
  Some older journals (e.g., *Annals of Tourism Research*, started 1992) have large total citation counts thanks to **decades-long** scholarship. In contrast, newly launched or recently included journals may show lower overall metrics simply due to **less citation-accumulation time**.

Conclusion & Summary

The data reinforce the **dominant local impact** of long-established tourism journals, particularly **Tourism Management**, **Annals of Tourism Research**, and **Journal of Travel Research**. They feature the highest h-index and citation counts, underscoring their **central role** in advancing tourism scholarship. Meanwhile, newer or more specialized journals can still exhibit a strong **m-index**, reflecting **rapid citation growth** in emerging areas.

In summary, the local impact indicators (h-index, g-index, m-index, total citations) demonstrate a **well-defined hierarchy** of core tourism journals while highlighting the potential for newer outlets to build influence quickly through highly cited research.

411 gt::gt(SourceLocImpact)

(data/figure/SourceLocImpact.png)

Sources' Production over Time

Description

The table shows the yearly publication counts from 1992 to 2025 for ten leading journals in tourism and hospitality:

1. **Tourism Management**

2. **Journal of Travel Research**

3. **Journal of Sustainable Tourism**

4. **Current Issues in Tourism**

5. **Annals of Tourism Research**

6. **International Journal of Tourism Research**

7. **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management**

8. **Tourism Management Perspectives**

9. **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research**

10. **International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management**

Early Years (1992–2002)

- **Annals of Tourism Research** dominates the early phase, appearing as early as 1992 with 1 publication, incrementally increasing to 4 publications by 2001.

- Other journals show **zero** publications during this period (e.g., Tourism Management, Journal of Travel Research).

Mid-Years (2003–2010)

- **Tourism Management** starts contributing in 2003 with 1 publication, growing to 9 publications by 2010.

- **Annals of Tourism Research** remains strong, going from 5 (2003) to 12 (2010).

- **Journal of Travel Research** emerges around 2009 with 2 publications, rising to 4 by 2010.

- **International Journal of Tourism Research** begins in 2008 with 1 article and reaches 4 by 2010.

Growth Phase (2011–2015)

- **Tourism Management** and **Annals of Tourism Research** steadily increase. For example, Tourism Management rises from 9 (2011) to 22 (2015).

- **Journal of Travel Research** climbs from 9 (2011) to 20 (2015).

- **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** picks up pace, moving from 1 in 2010 to 14 in 2015.

- **Current Issues in Tourism** also starts to gain momentum, reaching 8 by 2015.

Acceleration Period (2016–2020)

- **Tourism Management** demonstrates a notable surge, growing from 33 (2016) to 70 (2020).

- **Journal of Travel Research** expands from 28 (2016) to 45 (2020).

- **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** grows quickly, from 18 (2016) to 43 (2020).

- **Tourism Management Perspectives** (introduced in 2015) exhibits rapid early expansion, reaching 18 publications by 2020.

- **International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management** increases from 3 (2016) to 22 (2020).

Recent Years (2021–2025)

- Continued upward trend across all journals, with **Tourism Management** reaching 108 by 2025.

- **Journal of Travel Research** hits 97, **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** 96, and **Current Issues in Tourism** 90 by 2025.

- **Annals of Tourism Research** stabilizes at 73 from 2024 to 2025, suggesting a plateau in this dataset.

- **International Journal of Tourism Research** hits 69, **Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management** 55, and **Tourism Management Perspectives** 51 by 2025, all indicating robust yet slightly lower counts than the top three.

Interpretation

1. **Dominance Shift Over Time**

    - While **Annals of Tourism Research** was the earliest mover, **Tourism Management** eventually overtakes it in volume. Similarly, **Journal of Travel Research** shows later but sustained growth, indicating a dynamic shift of publication leadership.

2. **Rise of Sustainability and Specialized Focus**

- **Journal of Sustainable Tourism** experiences a substantial lift after the mid-2000s. This may reflect the growing global emphasis on **sustainable practices** and research funding or academic interest in this subfield.

3. **Emergence of New Titles**

- **Tourism Management Perspectives** launched around 2015 and grows quickly, suggesting a **demand for alternative outlets** or specific focus areas within tourism management.

- **Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research** also gains traction steadily from the 2010s onward, highlighting the **regional** research expansion in tourism.

4. **Overall Increasing Trend**

- Nearly all titles show an **upward trend** in publication counts, which underscores the **rapid expansion** of tourism and hospitality research overall.

- The convergence of counts by 2025 reveals **multiple well-established journals** in this domain rather than one or two dominating. This diversification indicates a maturing field with **varied themes and focal areas**.

Conclusion & Summary

In summary, the data reflect the **evolution of tourism and hospitality scholarship** over three decades. Early on, **Annals of Tourism Research** led the field; however, **Tourism Management** and **Journal of Travel Research** later rose to the forefront, indicating shifts in scholarly emphasis. The emergence and rapid rise of specialized journals (e.g., **Journal of Sustainable Tourism**, **Tourism Management Perspectives**) align with evolving research interests (sustainability, specialized management approaches). Ultimately, the growing publication counts suggest a **highly active and continually diversifying** research landscape.

gt::gt(SourceProdOverTime)

(data/figure/SourceProdOverTime.png)

Authors

Authors

Most Relevant Authors

Description

- **High-Volume Authors**

  – The list is headed by **UYSAL M** with **27** articles (fractional count: 8.75), followed by **FILEP S** (22 articles, 6.64 fractional) and **KIM S** (20 articles, 6.73 fractional).

  – These top contributors each have upwards of **15** total articles, indicating a **select group** who have published extensively in the field.

- **Fractionalized Authorship**

  – Fractional counts (e.g., 8.75 for 27 articles, 6.64 for 22 articles) reflect **shared authorship** roles.

  – Large differences between total articles and fractional counts (e.g., 27 vs. 8.75 for UYSAL M) suggest **collaborations** with multiple co-authors.

  – Authors with similar total articles may show varying fractional counts, indicating **differences in their level of contribution** across each collaboration.

- **Long Tail of Contributors**

  – After the top 10–15 names, there are many authors with **fewer total articles** (often under 10).

  – This highlights a **broad, dispersed community** of researchers contributing occasional or specialized studies.

- **Multiple Authors Named "KIM," "LEE," "WANG," "CHEN," "ZHANG," etc.**

  – Common surnames among East Asian authors appear frequently, underscoring the **global and particularly Asian** involvement in tourism/hospitality research.

  – Careful distinction is made via initials (e.g., KIM S, KIM H, KIM J) or fractional counts.

Interpretation

1. **Core Group of Influential Scholars**

   - Authors like **UYSAL M**, **FILEP S**, and **KIM S** have built **substantial publication portfolios**, indicating they may be **leading voices or prolific senior researchers** in tourism and hospitality scholarship.

2. **Significance of Collaborative Research**

- The gap between total articles and fractional authorship suggests **widespread co-authoring**. Researchers are forming teams to tackle complex topics, share expertise, and leverage cross-institutional resources.

3. **Globalization and Diversity**

- The presence of a **vast array of names** from varied linguistic backgrounds signals a **global research network**. Collaboration extends across continents, reflecting the **international nature** of tourism and hospitality studies.

4. **Potential Niche or Emergent Scholars**

- The numerous authors with **1 or 2** articles might be:
  - **Early-career academics** entering the field,

  - **Practitioners** co-authoring in specialized areas, or

  - **Occasional contributors** from adjacent disciplines (e.g., psychology, marketing, sustainability).

Conclusion & Summary

In summary, a **small group** of highly prolific authors stands out, evidenced by both **total** and **fractionalized** article counts. The **extensive collaborations** indicated by fractional authorship counts reflect the **team-based, interdisciplinary** nature of tourism research. Meanwhile, the **long tail** of smaller contributors underscores the field's **broad appeal** and **global reach**.

Overall, the data reveal a dynamic scholarly community with a few leading figures and many emergent or specialized voices, collectively shaping the ongoing development of tourism and hospitality research.

gt::gt(MostRelAuthors %>% filter(Articles >= 6))

(data/figure/MostRelAuthors.png)

Most Local Cited Authors

The provided bibliometric analysis focuses on "most local citations" related to the field. "Local citations" typically refer to the number of times an author's work is cited by other works within a specific dataset or field of study.

Description

- **Top Local Citations**
  - **UYSAL M** leads with **1049** local citations, significantly ahead of all other authors.

  - **SIRGY MJ** (830) and **KIM H** (654) also show notably high citation counts.

  - Others with 500+ citations include **WOO E** (536) and **NAWIJN J** (385).

- **Broad Range of Citation Counts**

– After the top tier (500+ citations), a **long list** of authors have citations ranging from a few hundred to single digits.

– The dataset extends down to authors with **1 or 2** local citations, indicating a **wide citation distribution** across many contributors.

- **Evidence of Numerous Contributors**

    – Hundreds of authors appear, reflecting **broad, collaborative research** in the field.

    – Many authors beyond the top 10–20 still maintain respectable citation counts (e.g., 50–200), underscoring a **robust middle tier**.

Interpretation

1. **Influential Scholars**

    - High local citations (500+) often align with **well-established researchers** who have published extensively on seminal or in-demand topics (e.g., tourism impact, quality of life, hospitality management).

    - **UYSAL M** and **SIRGY MJ** are prime examples of researchers whose foundational theories or frameworks likely generate ongoing citations.

2. **Academic Focus and Collaboration**

    - The number of authors listed indicates a **wide-reaching, collaborative field**.

    - Authors in the 100–300 citation range often engage in **multiple co-authored projects** across sub-disciplines (e.g., destination marketing, sustainable tourism). Their citation impact suggests **relevance and consistent publication** but perhaps with more specialized or emergent topics.

3. **Long Tail of New or Specialized Contributors**

    - Many authors with fewer citations could be **early-career academics**, **occasional contributors**, or scholars from related disciplines publishing in tourism/hospitality.

    - This "long tail" phenomenon is **typical of a mature field**, where a few authors lead in citations, but **many** still contribute in niche areas or collaborative projects.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, **local citation counts** reveal a **core group of highly influential authors** (e.g., Uysal, Sirgy, Kim) shaping major discussions in tourism and hospitality research. A **substantial middle tier** indicates a healthy ecosystem of established scholars, while the **long tail** underscores ongoing influx of new or specialized voices.

In summary, the breadth of authors and their varying citation levels signal a **diverse and dynamic research community**, with a few standout leaders consistently driving the field's academic conversations.

gt::gt(MostLocCitAuthors %>% filter(LocalCitations >= 100))

(data/figure/MostLocCitAuthors.png)

Authors' Production over Time

This bibliometric analysis reflects the scholarly publications on the topic by various authors over the years. Let's elaborate on the results, particularly focusing on the "authors' production over time":

Description

1. **Core Research Themes**

    - The recurring focus is on **well-being**, **quality of life (QOL)**, **mental health**, **residents' attitudes**, and **community development** in tourism contexts.

    - Many articles connect **destination competitiveness**, **tourism experience**, and **sustainability** to **subjective well-being**, underscoring how travelers' and residents' lives are impacted by tourism.

2. **Temporal and Topical Evolution**

    - **Earlier Publications** (2010–2013) emphasize foundational ideas:
        - The concept of **holiday happiness curves**

        - Measuring **tourists' changing emotions** over trip durations

        - Links between **leisure travel** and **life satisfaction**

    - **Mid-Period (2014–2017)**:
        - A surge in **co-creation** and **community-based** tourism research

        - Greater interest in **nature-based** or **heritage** tourism and their influences on **well-being**

        - Emergence of **casinos/gaming** and **festival events** to study impacts on host communities' QOL
    - **Recent Years (2018–2025)**:
        - Focused on **digital/virtual experiences**, **metaverse** or **VR tourism**, and **live streaming**

        - **Mental health** and **employee well-being** in hospitality contexts

        - **Diaspora festivals**, **transnational religious tourism**, and **interdisciplinary** approaches to QOL measurement

3. **High Citation vs. New Publications**

    - Older, seminal articles (e.g., 2015–2016) often have very high total citations and a notable **citations per year (TCpY)**.

- Many **2024–2025** publications show **low or zero** total citations due to their **recent release**, though some indicate promising themes (e.g., mental health, VR tourism) that align with emerging industry and societal trends.

4. **Key Authors and Contribution**

- **UYSAL M** appears extensively, highlighting a strong research focus on **quality of life**, **well-being** metrics, and **destination performance**.

- **FILEP S** consistently explores **tourist well-being** from a **positive psychology** perspective, including **hedonic/eudaimonic** frameworks.

- **KIM S, KIM H, SU LJ,** and others analyze **resident-tourist interactions**, **festival experiences**, and **community empowerment**.

- **Rasoolimanesh SM**, **Ramkissoon H**, **Prayag G**, **Croes R**, etc., focus on **sustainable tourism** and **destination management** through **quality-of-life** lenses.

Interpretation

1. **Growing Importance of Well-Being Paradigms**

- The repeated emphasis on **quality of life** and **subjective well-being** indicates a paradigm shift: tourism success is no longer measured solely by **economic gains**, but also by **social, psychological, and environmental** dimensions.

2. **Interdisciplinary and Global Collaboration**

- Many articles integrate frameworks from **psychology** (e.g., PERMA model), **sociology** (solidarity, empowerment), and **business/marketing** (value co-creation), showcasing cross-disciplinary research designs.

- Topics like **virtual reality** or **metaverse tourism** reveal expansions into **technological** and **digital** aspects of tourism experiences.

3. **Attention to Diverse Stakeholders**

- Authors increasingly examine **residents' attitudes**, **empowerment**, and **social responsibility**—indicating that the **host community** perspective is central to sustainable tourism.

- There is also attention to **employees' mental health** and **hospitality workplace** well-being, reflecting a holistic industry approach.

4. **Continued Innovation**

- Most recent publications (2023–2025) delve into **new theories** (e.g., diaspora and spiritual festivals, pet-accompanying tourism, K-pop music tourism, AI usage) to clarify how tourism fosters or hampers **well-being** across contexts.

- These directions suggest an **ongoing evolution** of tourism scholarship toward more **nuanced, human-centric** frameworks.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, the dataset underscores a **dynamic and continually diversifying** field of tourism research, with **well-being** and **quality of life** emerging as central metrics of both **traveler** and **resident** outcomes. The **broad range** of authors, years, and interdisciplinary theories reveal how tourism and hospitality scholarship is **expanding** to include **technological**, **social**, and **psychological** determinants of success.

In summary, the collective publications illustrate a **mature research landscape** increasingly focused on **sustainability, mental health**, and **community well-being**—a vital shift from purely economic perspectives to **holistic measures** of tourism's impact.

gt::gt(AuthorProdOverTime)

(data/figure/AuthorProdOverTime.png)

Lotka's Law

Lotka's Law is a fundamental principle in bibliometrics and scientometrics, which are fields concerned with the quantitative study of scientific and technological literature. Named after Alfred J. Lotka, who proposed the idea in 1926, this law describes the frequency with which authors publish in a particular field.

Lotka's Law can be represented mathematically as:

$$Y = \frac{C}{X^\alpha}$$

- Where:

    - Y is the number of authors making X contributions
    - C is a constant (it describes the number of authors making only one contribution)
    - $\square$ is a constant usually close to 2 (though it can vary depending on the discipline).

- Interpretation of Lotka's Law:

    1. **Majority Publishes Once**: A large number of authors will have only one publication, which corresponds to the value of C.
    2. **Decrease in Frequency**: As the number of publications per author (i.e., productivity) increases, the number of authors who have published that many times decreases, and this decrease is very sharp (often described as an inverse square law).
    3. **Few Prolific Authors**: Only a very small number of authors will be responsible for a large portion of the publications in a particular field. This can be thought of as the "80-20" principle, where a minority (often around 20%) of authors produce the majority (around 80%) of the work.

- Application:

    - **Identify Core Authors**: By applying Lotka's Law, organizations and researchers can identify the core authors or the most prolific contributors in a particular field or topic.

- **Analysis of Scientific Output**: Lotka's Law can be utilized to analyze the scientific output of a field, helping in recognizing the distribution of productivity among authors.
- **Research Evaluation**: Research institutions might use this principle to evaluate the research output of their faculty or departments, understanding the distribution of prolific authors versus those who publish less frequently.

It's worth noting that while Lotka's Law provides a useful general observation about scientific productivity, there are variations depending on the specific scientific discipline or field of study. The values of $ C $ and $ alpha $ might differ across disciplines, and in some cases, other bibliometric models might offer a better fit to the data.

- Measurement for the Lotka's law is the following:

    - N.Articles: This is the number of articles written by an author.
    - N.Authors: This is the number of authors who have written the corresponding N.Articles.
    - Freq: This is the frequency (proportion) of those authors relative to the total number of authors.

Description

The table shows how many authors have published *N* articles, alongside the **frequency** of authors for each *N*.

- **Highest Frequency at N=1**:

    - **2613 authors** (80.20%) have just **1** article, the largest group, indicating a "long tail" of contributors.

    - This high proportion of single-publication authors is typical in many scholarly fields, aligning with the **inverse-square** or **inverse-power** distribution suggested by Lotka's Law.

- **Gradual Decrease for Higher N**:

    - As the number of articles authored (*N*) increases, the number of authors contributing that many articles **decreases sharply**. For instance:
        * 2 articles: 377 authors (11.57%)

        * 3 articles: 106 authors (3.25%)

        * 5 articles: 31 authors (0.95%)

        * Very few authors produce **more than 10** articles.

- **Very Productive Authors**:

    - Only **1 author** has produced **27** articles, one has **22**, and one has **20**, illustrating the pattern in which a **tiny minority** of authors contributes a **large volume** of publications.

Interpretation

- **Classic Power-Law Behavior**:
  The table demonstrates a **steep power-law** (or Lotka-like) distribution, where **most** authors publish **just once**, while **a small subset** of highly productive authors accounts for many publications.

- **Field Maturity and Broad Inclusion**:
  The large proportion of single-publication authors signals:

    1. **Field Openness**: Many researchers (possibly from adjacent disciplines) publish occasionally in this domain.

    2. **Potential Collaboration**: Some of these single-publication authors may be graduate students or co-authors with senior researchers, indicating a collaborative environment.

- **Identification of Core Authors**:
  A handful of authors consistently publishing 10+ articles are likely **key influencers** or **thought leaders** in the research area. Their high productivity positions them at the center of scholarly discourse.

Conclusion & Summary

The data conform well to **Lotka's Law**, illustrating a typical **author productivity** pattern: 1. **Most** authors publish **one** article only.
2. A **much smaller group** demonstrates **moderate** productivity (2–5 articles).
3. An **extremely small cohort** of authors achieve **high** productivity (10+ articles).

In summary, these findings highlight a **highly skewed** productivity distribution common in scientific fields, where **a majority of authors** contribute a single study, and **a small group** drives a significant fraction of the total output.

gt::gt(LotkaLaw)

(data/figure/LotkaLaw.png)

Authors' Local Impact

- The followings are the measurement of the local impact

    – Element: Name of the author.
    – h_index: h-index of the author, which represents the maximum number of articles an author has written that have received at least the same number of citations.
    – g_index: g-index of the author, a metric that takes into account the distribution of citations received by a researcher's publications.
    – m_index: Rate of acquiring h-index points. It is calculated by dividing the h-index by the number of years since the first published paper of the author.
    – TC: Total citations the author has received.
    – NP: Number of publications by the author.
    – PY_start: The year of the author's first publication.

Description

- **High-Impact Leaders:**

    - **UYSAL M** stands out with an h-index of 16 and g-index of 27 from 27 publications (TC = 3007) since his first publication in 2013. His m-index of 1.23 indicates robust citation accumulation per year.
    - **NAWIJN J** (h = 14, g = 15, NP = 15, TC = 1219, PY_start = 2010) and **FILEP S** (h = 13, g = 22, NP = 22, TC = 582, PY_start = 2012) follow as influential authors in the dataset.

- **Diverse Productivity and Citation Profiles:**

    - Some authors, like **SU LJ** (h = 13, m = 1.18) and **KIM H** (h = 10, m = 0.91), show a solid balance between publication output and impact.

    - In contrast, **LEE CK** (h = 11, m = 0.48) has a longer career starting in 2003 with 13 articles, but a lower m-index indicates slower yearly citation accumulation.

- **Varied Career Stages:**

    - The starting years (PY_start) range from as early as 2003 (e.g., LEE CK) to more recent years such as 2020–2021 (e.g., ALRAWADIEH Z, WEN J), reflecting both long-established and emerging voices.
    - The m-index (TC/NP normalized by career length) helps compare authors across different career spans, revealing that more recent authors can achieve high annual impact even with fewer publications.

Interpretation

- **Citation Impact vs. Publication Volume:**

    - A high h-index and g-index generally point to a consistent influence of an author's work. For instance, UYSAL M's metrics (16/27) reflect that many of his 27 articles are highly cited.

    - Authors like NAWIJN J, with 15 publications and an h-index of 14, demonstrate that nearly every publication has contributed to his citation profile.

- **Normalized Productivity (m-index):**

    - The m-index gives insight into the annual impact. UYSAL M's m-index of 1.23 is particularly strong considering he started in 2013, meaning he has averaged a good citation rate each year.

    - Lower m-index values (e.g., LEE CK's 0.48) can be attributed to a longer career span where earlier publications may have had less impact or a slower rate of citation growth.

- **Field Evolution and Emerging Scholars:**

    - Authors with later start years (e.g., ALRAWADIEH Z, MITAS O) and relatively high m-index values suggest that newer contributions are quickly gaining recognition.

    - The range of indices across authors reflects the interdisciplinary and evolving nature of the field, where both established researchers and newer entrants contribute to its growth.

Conclusion & Summary

The local impact metrics reveal a **hierarchy of influence**: - **Core leaders** like UYSAL M, NAWIJN J, FILEP S, and SU LJ have achieved high citation impact relative to their output, indicating that their work is both prolific and influential. - **Normalized indices (m-index)** help account for differences in career duration, showing that newer authors can be very impactful on an annual basis. - Variations in metrics among authors with similar publication counts (NP) underline differences in citation performance and influence.

In summary, the data show a skewed distribution where a relatively small group of authors achieves high impact (reflected by high h- and g-indices and m-index values), while others have moderate performance. This pattern is typical in many academic fields, indicating that a few key researchers drive the bulk of the influential scholarship.

gt::gt(AuthorLocImpact %>% filter(h_index >= 5))

(data/figure/AuthorLocImpact.png)

Affiliations

Most Relevant Affiliations

The data provided is a bibliometric analysis focusing on the affiliations that have contributed to research related to psychological entitlement. Bibliometric analyses help understand the research landscape of a specific topic by evaluating the academic output from various institutions. The data lists different university systems and universities with the number of articles they've published on the topic.

Description

- **Top Affiliations by Article Count:**

    - **STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF FLORIDA** leads with **104 articles**.
    - **HONG KONG POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY** follows closely with **97 articles**.
    - **GRIFFITH UNIVERSITY** contributes **73 articles**, while **SUN YAT SEN UNIVERSITY** and **UNIVERSITY OF CENTRAL FLORIDA** add **56** and **55 articles**, respectively.

- **Diverse Global Representation:**

    - The list features institutions from North America (e.g., University of Central Florida, Texas A&M University System, Purdue University System), Asia (e.g., Sun Yat Sen University, Kyung Hee University, Zhejiang University), Australia (e.g., Griffith University, University of Queensland), and Europe (e.g., University of Surrey, Bournemouth University).
    - Some systems and multi-campus networks (e.g., Texas A&M University System, California State University System) indicate that research in tourism is often supported by large academic networks.

- **Specialized and Regional Institutions:**

    - A number of affiliations are focused on regional and applied research (e.g., Breda University of Applied Sciences, Macau University of Science and Technology), suggesting a strong applied orientation in tourism scholarship.
    - There are also specialized institutions that appear to concentrate on tourism/hospitality studies, such as City University of Macau and Taylor's University.

Interpretation

- **Geographic Diversity and Focus:**

    - The high-ranking affiliations come from regions with dynamic tourism sectors, suggesting that local industry relevance and regional economic importance drive research output.
    - Institutions from Florida, Hong Kong, and Australia dominate, reflecting their strong tourism industries and established research infrastructures.

- **Institutional Networks and Research Clusters:**

    - University systems (e.g., State University System of Florida, Texas A&M University System, California State University System) contribute significantly, demonstrating the role of institutional networks in fostering collaborative and high-volume research.

– The presence of both comprehensive universities and specialized institutions points to a balance between theoretical and applied research in tourism and hospitality.

- **Impact on Policy and Practice:**

    – Leading institutions often inform both academic debates and practical policy decisions in tourism. Their high article counts suggest they are key players in shaping sustainable tourism practices and industry standards.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, the distribution of articles across affiliations shows a **broad and globally diverse** network of institutions contributing to tourism research. A few key players—especially from regions with strong tourism industries—dominate the field, while a wide range of universities, from large state systems to specialized and regional institutions, enrich the research landscape with varied perspectives and applied insights.

In summary, the data underscore that major research outputs in tourism are concentrated in a handful of influential affiliations, reflecting regional economic importance, robust institutional networks, and a balance between theoretical and practical contributions in the field.

gt::gt(MostRelAffiliations %>% filter(Articles >= 20))

(data/figure/MostRelAffiliations.png)

Affiliations' Production over time

The table provided represents a bibliometric analysis of the production of articles related across different universities and university systems over a span of approximately two decades. Here's an elaboration and interpretation of the results for each institution:

Description

The table displays the yearly article output for several key affiliations in tourism research. Notable patterns include:

- **Delayed Start & Gradual Onset:**

    – Many institutions (e.g., **Kyung Hee University**, **Hong Kong Polytechnic University**, **University of Queensland**, and **State University System of Florida**) show no production in the early 1990s through the early 2000s.

    – Production begins modestly (often 1–2 articles per year) in the mid-2000s.

- **Steady Increase with Recent Acceleration:**

    – Over time, article counts gradually increase. For example, **Kyung Hee University** increases from 2–5 articles in the 2003–2013 period, reaching 13–14 articles by 2019–2021, and then leaping to 39–40 articles in 2024–2025.

- **Hong Kong Polytechnic University** similarly grows slowly until around 2014–2015, then accelerates dramatically: from 10 articles in 2016 to 90–97 articles by 2024–2025.

- Other affiliations, such as the **State University System of Florida** and **University of Central Florida**, show a similar pattern—little or no output in the early years and then a rapid ramp-up in the 2010s, peaking in the early 2020s.

- **Variation Among Institutions:**

  - While some institutions like **University of Queensland** and **Sun Yat Sen University** also show an upward trend, the magnitude and pace vary.

  - For instance, **Universidade do Algarve** had negligible output until 2017 and then a marked increase in recent years (from 1 article per year up to 39–40 articles by 2024–2025).

Interpretation

- **Field Maturation and Increased Emphasis:**
  The nearly universal absence of articles before the mid-2000s suggests that tourism research, at least as indexed in this dataset, was either in its infancy or not a priority at many institutions. The subsequent growth reflects:

  - A **maturation of the field** as tourism became an increasingly important economic, social, and environmental subject.
  - **Enhanced institutional support** and funding for tourism/hospitality research over time.

- **Exponential Growth in Recent Years:**
  The accelerated output from around 2018 onward for many affiliations (e.g., Hong Kong Polytechnic University, State University System of Florida) likely indicates:

  - A surge in research interest driven by global trends such as sustainability, digital transformation (e.g., virtual tourism), and the COVID-19 pandemic's impact on travel.
  - Greater collaboration and interdisciplinary approaches that boost publication output.

- **Regional Differences:**
  Institutions in regions with vibrant tourism industries (e.g., Florida, Hong Kong, Australia) exhibit particularly high growth rates. In contrast, some institutions with later entry into the field (e.g., Universidade do Algarve) show a delayed but rapid ramp-up, perhaps as the region's tourism issues gained prominence.

Conclusion & Summary

The data reveal that the production of tourism research has experienced a significant, mostly exponential increase over the past two decades. While many key affiliations showed little or no output in the early years, all have ramped up their production substantially, with especially dramatic increases observed from around 2018 onward.

In summary, these trends underscore the growing academic and practical importance of tourism research worldwide. The consistent rise in article output across diverse institutions reflects both a maturing field and the increasing global relevance of tourism, sustainability, and hospitality studies.

963 gt::gt(AffOverTime)

964 (data/figure/AffOverTime.png)

Countries

Corresponding Author's Countires

The data presented offers a bibliometric analysis of psychological entitlement based on the country of the corresponding author. Here's an interpretation and elaboration of the results:

Description

- **Top Producers by Article Count:**

  - **China** leads with 304 articles (≈19.58% of total), followed by the **USA** with 261 articles (≈16.81%), and then the **United Kingdom** (116 articles, ≈7.47%) and **Australia** (107 articles, ≈6.89%).

  - Other notable contributors include **Korea** (80 articles), **Spain** (73), **Portugal** (53), **India** (48), **Italy** (36), and **Canada** (33).

- **Collaboration Patterns (SCP vs. MCP):**

  - **Single Country Publications (SCP)** vs. **Multiple Country Publications (MCP)** provide insight into collaboration intensity. For example, China has 174 SCP and 130 MCP, meaning about 42.76% of its output is international collaboration.

  - The USA shows a lower international share at 33.72% (173 SCP vs. 88 MCP).

  - In contrast, countries such as **Korea** (68.75% MCP) and **Malaysia** (68% MCP) have a high proportion of multi-country collaborations.
  - Some European countries (e.g., UK at 41.38%, Australia at 49.53%) show a balance between domestic and international outputs, whereas others (e.g., Spain at 26.03%, India at 14.58%) lean more toward domestic research.

Interpretation

- **Volume and Influence:**

  - The top-producing countries (China, USA, UK, Australia) dominate overall production. Their high output may be driven by strong national research systems, significant tourism industries, and a high level of academic investment in tourism and hospitality studies.

- **International Collaboration Trends:**

  - Higher MCP percentages in countries like Korea and Malaysia suggest that researchers there are highly engaged in cross-border collaborations. This can enrich research by bringing diverse perspectives and may reflect the strategic importance of global networks in rapidly evolving tourism contexts.
  - Lower MCP percentages for countries like India and Spain indicate that a larger share of their research is produced domestically. This might reflect either a strong local research community or less integration into international collaborative networks.

- **Regional Dynamics:**

    – Many of the top-producing countries are from regions with vibrant tourism industries and strong governmental or institutional support for tourism research. The collaboration patterns can also hint at differences in research culture—some regions may prioritize international partnership while others focus on addressing local issues.

Conclusion & Summary

These country-level data reveal that a few countries (China and the USA, in particular) produce a significant share of tourism research, while international collaboration levels vary considerably. Higher international collaboration percentages in countries like Korea and Malaysia suggest that global networks play a critical role in advancing their research, whereas other nations tend to produce more domestic work.

In summary, the data underscore both the concentration of research output in a few major countries and the diverse collaboration strategies that reflect regional priorities and research cultures in the field of tourism and hospitality.

gt::gt(CorrAuthCountries)

(data/figure/CorrAuthCountries.png)

Countries' Scientific Production

Description

- **Top Producers by Region:**

    – **China** leads with **774** publications, followed by the **USA** (679) and **Australia** (287).

    – Other significant contributors include the **UK** (282), **Spain** (172), **Portugal** (171), and **South Korea** (170). These regions represent a major portion of global tourism research output.

- **Moderate Contribution from Other Regions:**

    – Countries such as **India** (105), **New Zealand** (82), **Malaysia** (81), and **Canada** (70) contribute notably fewer publications but still hold importance in the global tourism research landscape.

- **Smaller Regional Contributions:**

    – Several countries in Europe and Asia have **lesser contributions** with countries like **Finland**, **Japan**, and **Austria** having around 30–40 publications, showing less intense involvement in tourism research compared to the top countries.

- **Emerging or Niche Contributors:**

    – **Smaller countries** like **Vietnam** (20), **Poland** (19), **Ghana** (18), **Switzerland** (18), **Mexico** (17), and **Russia** (17) have a more specialized presence in tourism research.
    – **Emerging economies** such as **Ethiopia**, **Kazakhstan**, and **Uruguay** (2–3 publications) show **nascent involvement**, possibly linked to the growing interest in tourism within these regions.

Interpretation

- **Dominance of Major Tourism Markets:**

  - The most prolific regions—**China, USA, Australia, UK**—reflect the **global tourism leaders** in terms of both research output and tourism industry influence. These regions invest significantly in tourism studies due to their established academic and tourism infrastructures.

- **Increasing Participation from Asia and Europe:**

  - **South Korea** and **Malaysia** show a strong growth trend, with **South Korea** reaching 170 publications. This signals an expanding interest in tourism research in the **Asian market**, particularly in areas related to culture, sustainability, and technology in tourism.
  - **Portugal**, **Spain**, and **Italy** reflect strong regional engagement with tourism, likely tied to the **importance of tourism** to their respective economies and cultures.

- **Global Disparities in Research Contribution:**

  - Regions like **Africa**, **South America**, and parts of **Eastern Europe** (e.g., **Nigeria**, **Ethiopia**, **Argentina**) contribute relatively fewer articles, signaling potential **gaps** in academic capacity or less research infrastructure dedicated to tourism.

  - Countries with fewer publications (e.g., **Bhutan**, **Morocco**, **Costa Rica**) are often niche players, possibly engaged in specific tourism sectors or facing more localized research needs.

- **Research Diffusion and Specialization:**

  - Countries like **Qatar**, **Kazakhstan**, and **Nepal** show growing but still modest contributions. This suggests a **broadening of tourism scholarship**, especially in emerging markets or regions with developing tourism industries.

Conclusion & Summary

The data reveal a clear **concentration of tourism research** in a few regions such as **China, the USA, Australia**, and the **UK**, with **emerging contributions** from countries in **Asia, Europe**, and **Africa**. The varying article counts reflect global disparities in research focus, academic infrastructure, and regional tourism development.

In summary, the data point to **established regions dominating tourism research** while others are beginning to engage more actively. This highlights **regional specialization** and **growing interest** in tourism research worldwide, indicating the field's broadening scope and diverse focus areas across the globe.

gt::gt(CountrySciProd)

(data/figure/CountrySciProd.png)

Countires' Production over Time

Description

- **USA**
  - The USA shows a **gradual increase** in publications from **1992 (1 article)** to **2025 (679 articles)**.
  - A **significant surge** begins around 2010, with output increasing from **26 articles in 2010** to **377 articles in 2021**.
  - **Post-2020**, the USA maintains strong growth, producing **314 articles in 2020**, **457 in 2022**, and **650 articles in 2024**.

- **China**
  - **China** starts with almost no publications until **2007** (2 articles), then **gradually ramps up** in the following years.
  - In recent years, China has seen explosive growth, with **272 articles in 2021**, **340 in 2022**, and **485 in 2023**.

  - By **2025**, China is projected to produce **774 articles**, surpassing the USA.

- **United Kingdom**
  - The UK also sees a **steady increase**, especially from **2016 (33 articles)** to **2025 (282 articles)**.

  - A significant **jump in production** occurs after **2019** as the UK's article output reaches **94 in 2020** and **154 in 2022**.

- **Australia**
  - **Australia** shows consistent growth from **2006** (1 article) to **287 articles in 2025**.
  - A major increase occurs in the last decade, from **38 articles in 2016** to **227 articles in 2023**, with projections to exceed **282 articles** in 2024.

- **South Korea**
  - South Korea shows a **modest but steady rise**, starting from **4 articles in 2003** to **170 articles in 2025**.
  - The output grows rapidly starting around **2018**, with **53 articles** in 2019 and **68 in 2020**, peaking at **166 articles in 2024**.

- **Portugal**
  - **Portugal** starts with very few articles and slowly increases production after **2013**. By **2025**, it reaches **171 articles**.
  - **Recent years** have seen substantial growth, with **104 articles in 2023** and projections to hit **162 in 2024**.

- **New Zealand**
  - **New Zealand** shows slow and steady growth, from **0 articles in 1992** to **82 articles in 2025**.

– The recent surge is evident, especially in **2020** (40 articles) and continuing through **2023** (72 articles).

- **India**

    – **India** had a **slow start** with only **1 article in 2017**, but the pace picked up dramatically after **2020**, with **100 articles projected in 2024** and **105 articles in 2025**.

    – **India's growth** is significant, reflecting increasing academic interest in tourism studies.

Interpretation

- **Exponential Growth in Major Countries:**

    – The USA, China, and the UK show exponential growth, especially after **2010**, with an acceleration in the **2020s**. This suggests an increasing recognition of tourism research as a key academic and policy area.

- **Emerging Global Players:**

    – **China's rise** in recent years, especially from **2020 onward**, reflects its growing tourism industry, which is now a **global leader** in both academic research and tourism practice.
    – **South Korea and Portugal** show steady growth, with South Korea maintaining a higher proportion of international collaborations.

- **Smaller Regions Showing Increasing Production:**

    – **New Zealand and India** demonstrate rapid progress in recent years, particularly as the tourism sectors in these regions receive more global attention.

Conclusion & Summary

Overall, **global tourism research** is witnessing **substantial growth**, with key countries like **USA**, **China**, **UK**, and **Australia** driving a large share of publications. The steady rise of **South Korea**, **Portugal**, and **New Zealand**, along with **India's exponential growth** post-2020, highlights a **maturing field** in diverse global contexts.

In summary, these trends reflect the **global expansion** of tourism scholarship, underscoring the increasing importance of tourism research across all regions, driven by both **academic interest** and the **rapid evolution of global tourism markets**.

gt::gt(CountryProdOverTime)

(data/figure/CountryProdOverTime.png)

Most Cited Countries

Description

- **Top Cited Countries**:

- **USA** leads with a total of **12,019 citations**, with an average of **46 citations per article**.

- **China** (6,727 citations, 22.1 citations per article) and the **United Kingdom** (4,930 citations, 42.5 citations per article) are the next most cited countries.

- Other high-impact countries include **Italy** (average 50.2 citations), **Malaysia** (45.2 citations), and **Hungary** (75.4 citations), which show strong citation rates relative to their number of articles.

- **Moderate Citation Countries**:

  - **Australia** (3,613 citations, 33.8 citations per article), **Korea** (2,719 citations, 34 citations per article), and **Spain** (1,890 citations, 25.9 citations per article) also have a solid citation output but at a lower rate compared to the leading countries.

- **Countries with Lower Citations**:

  - **Portugal** (605 citations, 11.4 citations per article) and **South Africa** (161 citations, 13.4 citations per article) have a lower total citation count, which may be due to fewer articles or a more recent entry into the tourism research field.

- **Niche or Emerging Contributors**:

  - Countries like **Mauritius** (99 citations, 99 citations per article), **Estonia** (94.5 citations per article), and **United Arab Emirates** (90 citations per article) have high average citation counts, despite publishing fewer articles, reflecting their emerging prominence in niche areas of tourism research.

Interpretation

1. **High Citation Countries (USA, China, UK)**:

   - The **USA**, **China**, and **United Kingdom** are clearly the dominant players in the tourism research field. The **USA**'s total citation count is significantly higher, reflecting its well-established research infrastructure, extensive tourism industry, and academic influence.
   - **China's growth** in citations reflects its expanding importance as a global tourism destination and the growing academic focus on Chinese tourism-related studies.

2. **Countries with High Citations per Article**:

   - **Hungary**, **UAE**, and **Estonia** stand out with high citations per article, suggesting that their contributions, while fewer, are highly influential in the field. These countries may be publishing fewer articles, but those that are published have a **strong impact** on the academic discourse.

3. **Balanced Citation-Production Relationship**:

   - **Australia** and **Korea** show a **steady output** with a **reasonable** number of citations per article. This suggests a **healthy level of international recognition** for their work, with a growing academic presence in tourism studies.

4. **Moderate to Low Citation Impact in Some Regions**:

- Countries such as **South Africa**, **Portugal**, **Thailand**, and **India** show relatively lower citation counts. This could reflect **smaller research outputs** or the **recent growth** of their tourism research communities.
- Countries like **Vietnam**, **Greece**, and **Sri Lanka** have low citation counts, potentially due to their **more niche or emerging status** in global tourism research.

Conclusion & Summary

The data reveal a **clear dominance** of countries like the **USA**, **China**, and the **UK** in terms of total citations, with **Italy**, **Malaysia**, and **Hungary** standing out for their **high citation per article** ratios. Emerging countries such as **Mauritius** and **Estonia** demonstrate significant influence relative to their article output, suggesting targeted contributions to key areas of tourism research.

In summary, the global tourism research landscape is highly concentrated in a few countries but also features significant contributions from **niche** and **emerging regions** with increasing academic influence. The **USA, China**, and **the UK** continue to lead, while **smaller countries** are gaining momentum, particularly in specific research areas.

gt::gt(MostCitCountries)

(data/figure/MostCitCountries.png)

Documents

Documents

Most Global Cited Documents

Description

- **Document Diversity**:
  The table lists key documents in tourism research, identified by paper title, DOI, total citations, citations per year, and a normalized citation score. These documents span a range of publication years and include both seminal and more recent contributions.

- **Citation Metrics**:

  - **Total Citations (TC)** vary widely—from documents with over 700 citations (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* with 704 TC) to those in the lower range (e.g., several papers with TC around 10–20).
  - **Citations per Year (TC per Year)** show how frequently a paper is cited on an annual basis. Notably, some recent documents (e.g., *ZHENG DN, 2021* with 97.6 TC per Year) have very high annual citation rates, suggesting rapid recognition.
  - **Normalized TC** adjusts citation counts for factors such as publication age, highlighting the relative impact. Here, values range significantly—for instance, *ZHENG DN, 2021* has a normalized TC of 16.27, whereas others are below 1, indicating that some papers are far more influential relative to their publication time.

- **Journal Sources and Authorship**:
  The documents are published in well-regarded journals (e.g., *Annals of Tourism Research, Journal of Travel Research, Tourism Management*) and represent contributions from prominent authors, reinforcing their status as key works in the field.

Interpretation

- **Seminal Contributions**:
  Papers with very high total citations and normalized scores (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* and *ZHENG DN, 2021*) are likely to be seminal studies. Their high TC per Year values further suggest that these works have had a strong and sustained impact over time.

- **Rapid Uptake of Recent Research**:
  Some recent publications show impressive annual citation rates. For example, *ZHENG DN, 2021* achieves 97.6 citations per year, which, when normalized, indicates an exceptional influence compared to peers published in similar time frames.

- **Relative Impact Variability**:
  The wide range in normalized TC values reflects differences in how papers perform relative to the expected citation rate for their publication age. Documents with normalized TC values well above 1 are outperforming the typical citation benchmarks in tourism research.

- **Field Evolution**:

  The mix of older, highly cited documents with more recent works that are rapidly accumulating citations illustrates the dynamic evolution of tourism research. It underscores that while foundational works continue to be referenced, innovative new studies are also making significant impacts.

Conclusion & Summary

The analysis of the most globally cited documents in tourism research reveals a heterogeneous but influential set of publications. Key papers—such as those by *SHARPLEY R (2014)* and *ZHENG DN (2021)*—demonstrate both high cumulative and annual citation metrics, marking them as seminal contributions. The normalized citation scores further confirm that some documents have an impact far exceeding the norm for their publication period. In summary, this bibliometric snapshot highlights not only the long-standing foundational studies in tourism research but also emerging works that are rapidly shaping the field.

gt::gt(MostGlobCitDocs %>% filter(Total.Citations >= 10))

(data/figure/MostGlobCitDocs.png)

Most Local Cited Documents

This section examines the most locally cited documents in our dataset. The table below provides key metrics for each document including: - **Local Citations**: Citations received within the local (disciplinary or community-specific) dataset. - **Global Citations**: Total citations received worldwide. - **Ratio**: The percentage of local citations relative to global citations. - **Normalized Local/Global Citations**: Citation counts that have been adjusted (typically by publication age) to allow fairer comparisons across documents.

Description

- **Citation Distribution**

  - The documents show a wide variation in both local and global citations. For instance, *UYSAL M, 2016, TOURISM MANAGE* received 256 local and 554 global citations, whereas other papers in the lower part of the list have local citations as low as 1–2.
  - The **Ratio** (Local/Global × 100) ranges broadly. Some documents (e.g., *UYSAL M, 2016*) have a ratio near 46%, meaning nearly half of their citations come from the local community, while others (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014*) have a lower ratio (~16%), indicating a greater share of citations coming from outside the local context.

- **Normalized Citation Metrics**

  - The **Normalized Local Citations** vary from below 1 to over 14, and the **Normalized Global Citations** range similarly. These numbers adjust for factors like publication age so that more recent papers are compared fairly with older, more established works.
  - For example, *VADA S, 2020, TOUR MANAG PERSPECT* shows a high normalized local citation (13.43) compared to a normalized global citation of 3.89, suggesting a very strong local impact relative to its overall citation performance.

- **Publication Year Spread**

– The sample spans from earlier publications (e.g., 2004) to recent works (projected up to 2025). Older documents tend to accumulate higher absolute citation counts, but normalization helps reveal their relative impact when accounting for the time available to be cited.

Interpretation

• **Local vs. Global Impact**

– A high **Local/Global Ratio** implies that a document is especially influential within its local research community. For instance, *UYSAL M (2016)* with a ratio of 46.2% indicates that nearly half of its influence is local.
– Conversely, documents with a lower ratio (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* at 16.3%) may have broader global appeal and are cited more by researchers outside the immediate field.

• **Normalized Citation Insights**

– The normalized metrics help in comparing documents of different ages. A high normalized local citation value (such as that for *VADA S, 2020*) highlights a paper that, despite being newer, has achieved substantial local recognition.
– In some cases, normalized global citations remain high (e.g., *SHARPLEY R, 2014* and *KIM K, 2013*), indicating that these documents not only serve as core references in the local community but also enjoy widespread international attention.

• **Variability Across Documents**

– The variation in both absolute and normalized citation metrics suggests diversity in research impact. Some papers achieve a strong local resonance while others gain more global recognition.
– The distribution also reflects disciplinary differences and possibly the evolving citation practices within the field over time.

Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion:
The analysis of the most locally cited documents reveals distinct patterns of impact. Some documents (e.g., *UYSAL M, 2016*) are highly influential within the local research community, as evidenced by a high local-to-global citation ratio and strong normalized local citation scores. In contrast, other seminal works such as *SHARPLEY R, 2014* are characterized by a lower local ratio, indicating broader international recognition. The normalized metrics further allow us to compare documents across different publication years, highlighting both enduring and emerging contributions.

Summary:
- **Pattern:** Wide variability in local and global citations with ratios ranging from ~16% to over 46%. Normalized metrics adjust for publication age, revealing the relative local and global impacts. - **Interpretation:** Documents with higher local ratios demonstrate stronger influence within the field's core community, while those with lower ratios are more globally cited. Normalized values help identify papers that have rapidly accumulated impact relative to their age. - **Overall:** This bibliometric snapshot underscores the dual dimensions of research influence—local and global—and highlights the dynamic and multifaceted nature of scholarly impact in tourism research.

```
gt::gt(MostLocCitDocs %>% filter(Local.Citations >= 10))
```

1301 (data/figure/MostLocCitDocs.png)

Cited References

Most Local Cited References

Description

- **Skewed Citation Distribution:**

  - A few foundational works (e.g., Fornell, 1981 with 272 citations; Uysal, 2016 with 256 citations; Hair, 2010 with 240 citations) dominate the citation counts.
  - Many other references have citations ranging from the low teens up to around 70, indicating a long tail of influential but less☐cited works.

- **Multidisciplinary Influences:**

  - The list includes works from marketing research (e.g., Fornell, 1981; Hair, 2010), psychology (e.g., Maslow, 1943; Kahneman, 2004), and tourism/hospitality (e.g., Uysal, 2016; Chen, 2013).
  - This suggests that local scholarship in tourism draws on a wide range of theories and method-ologies.

- **Seminal Theoretical and Methodological Contributions:**

  - Many references are recognized as key sources for measurement instruments and conceptual frameworks (e.g., the works on structural equation modeling, quality-of-life, and satisfaction).
  - Several classic texts (e.g., Maslow's works, Seligman's writings, and foundational works on social indicators) continue to influence current research.

Interpretation

- **Central Role of Seminal Works:**

  - The highest cited references have become "canonical" in the field, serving as standard bench-marks and foundational theories that shape subsequent research.
  - High citation counts for works like Fornell (1981) and Uysal (2016) indicate their wide accep-tance and use in building and validating measurement models and conceptual frameworks in tourism research.

- **Interdisciplinary Nature of Research:**

  - The diversity of sources (from marketing and psychology to tourism and hospitality) highlights the interdisciplinary nature of research in this domain.
  - This integration enriches the field by providing multiple perspectives and robust methodological approaches.

- **Enduring Influence and Evolving Scholarship:**

  - Many older references (e.g., seminal articles from the 1980s and 1990s) remain highly cited, which underscores their enduring influence.
  - Newer works, though cited less in absolute terms, are contributing to contemporary debates and methodologies, as seen with recent articles from 2020 and 2021.

Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion:

The most locally cited references reveal a heavily skewed distribution where a few seminal works dominate the landscape. These influential texts span across several disciplines, indicating the interdisciplinary foundation of tourism and hospitality research. They serve as both the theoretical and methodological bedrock of the field, guiding current studies and the development of new frameworks.

Summary:

- **Pattern:**

- A small number of foundational works receive very high citation counts, while many other important references are cited at levels between 10 and 70. - The references encompass a broad range of disciplines, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of tourism research. - **Interpretation:**

- High citation counts point to the enduring impact of seminal studies in shaping measurement, theory, and practice. - The diverse disciplinary sources underline how tourism research integrates insights from psychology, marketing, and management. - **Overall:**

- These locally cited references form the backbone of the scholarly community, serving as key resources that inform research design, methodology, and theoretical development in tourism and hospitality studies.

gt::gt(MostLocCitRefs %>% filter(Citations >= 10))

(data/figure/MostLocCitRefs.png)

References Spectroscopy

When we talk about "References Spectroscopy" in the context of bibliometrics, we are drawing an analogy with the spectroscopic techniques used in the physical sciences to analyze materials based on the spectrum of the radiation they emit or absorb.

- Reference Spectrum: Just as a material has a unique spectrum in physical spectroscopy, a research paper or topic will have a unique "spectrum" of references it cites. This spectrum can give insight into the foundational works for that paper or topic, indicating which previous works are most influential or relevant.
- Analysis: By examining the "spectra" (or citation patterns) of multiple papers or topics, one can identify trends, clusters, and gaps in the research landscape. This is analogous to how one might use spectroscopy to categorize and analyze different materials based on their spectral signatures.
- Evolution Over Time: Just as the spectrum of a star can tell us about its age and stage in the lifecycle, looking at the changing citation patterns or "spectra" over time can reveal how a field or topic has evolved. It can show which works have become foundational over time or which ones have fallen out of favor.
- Intensity & Peaks: In physical spectroscopy, the intensity of certain peaks in a spectrum can indicate the concentration of specific elements or compounds. Similarly, in bibliometrics, certain references might be cited much more frequently than others, indicating their centrality or importance to the field. These "peaks" in the citation spectrum can point to seminal works or pivotal authors in a domain.
- Comparative Analysis: By comparing the "spectra" of different papers, topics, or even researchers, one can identify overlaps, synergies, and distinctions. This can be useful for interdisciplinary research, collaboration opportunities, or understanding the landscape of a broad field.

- Anomalies & Outliers: Sometimes, a spectrum will have unexpected peaks or features. In bibliometrics, unexpected citation patterns might indicate emerging areas of interest, interdisciplinary bridges, or even issues like citation cartels or excessive self-citation.
- Application: Just as spectroscopy has practical applications in material identification, quality control, and more, bibliometric "spectroscopy" can be used for research evaluation, funding allocation, curriculum design, and other academic or research management tasks.

In essence, the concept of "References Spectroscopy" in bibliometrics is a metaphorical way of describing the deep analysis of citation patterns to understand the structure, evolution, and dynamics of scholarly research.

The "Reference publication year spectroscopy" (RPYS) is a method to analyze the age of cited references in a given publication set. It can reveal the seminal works and foundational literature within a topic or domain. Let's break down and interpret the given data on the bibliometric analysis:

Description

- **Time Range and Citation Counts:**

  - The data spans from as early as 1749 to 2025.
  - For each publication year, the table lists the number of citations received.
  - Two difference metrics are provided:
    * **diffMedian5:** The difference relative to a 5-year median.
    * **diffMedian:** The difference relative to an overall median.

- **Spectral Peaks:**

  - Some years show very high citation counts (e.g., 1988: 772 citations; 1999: 1701 citations; 2000: 2151 citations; 2010: 4595 citations; 2017: 6451 citations; 2020: 7480 citations).
  - These peaks indicate years in which particularly influential works were published.

- **Recent Years and Decline:**

  - After 2020, citation counts drop significantly (e.g., 2021: 5502; 2022: 3648; 2023: 2525; 2024: 1057; 2025: 39).
  - This decline is expected for very recent years since newer publications have had less time to be cited.

Interpretation

- **Foundational Works and Seminal Years:**

  - The peaks in certain years represent "spectral signatures" of foundational works in the field. For example:
    * **1988 Peak (772 citations, diffMedian = 316):** Suggests that seminal contributions published in 1988 have become critical reference points.
    * **Late 1990s to Early 2000s Peaks (1701–2151 citations):** Indicate a period of high impact research that likely shaped current theories and methodologies.
    * **2010 and Beyond:** The strong peak in 2010 (4595 citations) and subsequent increases through 2017 (6451 citations) highlight a modern wave of influential work.

- **Evolution Over Time:**

    – The "spectrum" shows how the influential literature evolves:

        ∗ Early periods (18th and 19th centuries) contribute sparsely.
        ∗ Modern scholarship (late 20th century onward) provides a concentrated set of seminal
          works that dominate the citation landscape.

- **Intensity and Anomalies:**

    – The intensity (i.e., the height of the peaks) points to the centrality of key publications.

    – Abrupt declines in very recent years are less a sign of diminishing quality than a reflection of
      citation lag—newer articles have not yet had sufficient time to accumulate citations.

- **Comparative and Trend Analysis:**

    – By comparing the citation "spectra" across time intervals, one can identify periods of rapid
      development or paradigm shifts in the field.
    – The data can also be used to spot potential anomalies or emerging trends when unusual peaks
      or valleys appear.

Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion:

Reference Publication Year Spectroscopy provides a "spectral fingerprint" of a research field by mapping
the age distribution of cited literature. The analysis reveals that certain years—often corresponding to
seminal publications—dominate the citation landscape. Over time, these peaks mark periods of high impact
and foundational contributions, while the recent decline reflects the natural citation lag for new works.

Summary:

- Data Pattern:

- A wide temporal range with a few distinct peaks that highlight seminal publication years. - Difference
metrics (diffMedian5 and diffMedian) help accentuate these peaks relative to typical citation levels.

- **Interpretation:**

    – High citation peaks indicate the publication years of works that have become cornerstones of
      the field.
    – The evolution of the spectrum shows how foundational literature has accumulated over time,
      with recent years naturally showing lower counts due to citation lag.

- **Overall Insight:**

    – RPYS is a powerful bibliometric tool that, by "spectroscoping" reference publication years,
      identifies the key historical contributions and tracks the evolution of scholarly influence within
      a discipline.

gt::gt(RPYS[68941:69217, 1:4])

(data/figure/RPYS.png)

Words

Most Frequent Words

The provided data lists the most relevant words and their occurrences in a bibliometric analysis related to the topic.

Description

- **High-Frequency Terms:**

    – *Quality-of-life* (371 occurrences), *satisfaction* (326), and *tourism* (294) dominate the list. These high frequencies indicate that these topics are central to the research field.
    – Other major terms include *happiness* (219), *perceptions* (204), *attitudes* (189), and *impact* (177).

- **Thematic Clusters:**

    – **Well-Being and Quality:** Words like *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, *happiness*, and *life satisfaction* suggest a strong focus on personal and communal well-being in the context of tourism.
    – **Experience and Behavior:** The presence of terms such as *experience*, *experiences*, *behavior*, and *behavioral intentions* indicates an emphasis on how individuals experience tourism and the resulting behaviors.
    – **Management and Service:** Words like *management*, *service quality*, *performance*, and *customer satisfaction* highlight the operational and strategic side of tourism studies.
    – **Sustainability and Community:** Terms such as *sustainable tourism*, *community*, *residents*, *destination*, and *conservation* reflect the growing attention on environmental and social sustainability within the industry.
    – **Methodological and Theoretical Constructs:** Other recurring words such as *model*, *scale*, *pls-sem*, and *framework* suggest the use of sophisticated methodological tools and theoretical frameworks in the literature.

- **Distribution Characteristics:**

    – The frequency distribution is highly skewed—a small number of key terms appear with very high frequency, while many terms cluster near the lower threshold (5–10 occurrences). This pattern is typical of bibliometric data and reflects the influence of Zipf's law in language.

Interpretation

- **Central Themes:**

    – **Quality and Well-Being:** The very high frequency of terms related to quality-of-life and satisfaction indicates that these concepts are the backbone of research in tourism and hospitality. Scholars are deeply invested in understanding how tourism affects personal and community well-being.
    – **Experiential and Behavioral Dimensions:** Frequent use of terms such as experience, behavioral intentions, and perceptions underlines the importance of understanding both the subjective experiences of tourists and their subsequent behaviors.

  – **Operational Focus:** Keywords such as management, service quality, and performance point to an emphasis on practical applications in tourism management, including improving service delivery and operational efficiency.
  – **Sustainability and Social Impact:** The appearance of sustainability-related terms (e.g., sustainable tourism, conservation, community participation) shows that environmental, social, and economic sustainability are critical issues being addressed in the field.

- **Methodological Insights:**

  – The presence of technical terms such as model, scale, and pls-sem suggests that advanced statistical and modeling techniques are widely applied in tourism research.
  – The spread of terms related to both qualitative (e.g., grounded theory, narratives) and quantitative (e.g., structural model, panel-data) methods indicates a mixed-methods approach in the literature.

- **Implications for the Research Field:**

  – The strong emphasis on quality-of-life, satisfaction, and experiential aspects implies that tourism research is not only concerned with economic outcomes but also with the social and psychological impacts of tourism.
  – The diversity of terms also highlights the interdisciplinary nature of the field, intersecting marketing, psychology, management, and sustainability studies.

Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion:

The word frequency analysis—our "word frequency spectroscopy"—reveals a dynamic and multifaceted research landscape. Central themes such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, and tourism experiences dominate the discourse, while a variety of supporting concepts (e.g., service quality, sustainability, behavioral intentions) underscore the field's complexity and interdisciplinarity.

Summary:

- **Pattern:**

- A few key terms appear very frequently, establishing the core focus of the literature. - The distribution follows a typical skewed pattern, with many terms clustering at lower frequencies. - **Interpretation:**

- The prominence of well-being, experiential, and operational keywords signals that the field values both the subjective and objective aspects of tourism. - The methodological terms indicate robust, diverse approaches to researching these topics. - **Overall Insight:**

- This "spectroscopy" of word frequencies helps identify the central pillars of the literature and guides researchers toward understanding the foundational themes, emerging trends, and interdisciplinary nature of tourism research.

By understanding these patterns, scholars and practitioners can better appreciate the evolution, current focus, and potential future directions of research in tourism and hospitality.

gt::gt(MostFreqWords %>% filter(Occurrences >= 5))

(data/figure/MostFreqWords.png)

(data/figure/wordcloud.png)

1526 (data/figure/wordtreemap.png)

Words' Frequency over Time

The provided table offers a bibliometric analysis of the frequency of specific words related to the topic over a span of two decades.

Description

- **General Upward Trend:**
  Across all key terms, there is a clear and steady increase in frequency over time. Starting from minimal occurrences in the early 2000s (with many zeros in 2001–2002), the numbers gradually climb with notable acceleration in later years.

- **Term-Specific Observations:**

  - **Quality-of-life:**
    Initially absent or very low in frequency, this term shows exponential growth—rising to 371 occurrences by 2025.
  - **Satisfaction and Tourism:**
    Both terms follow a similar upward trend, indicating sustained and growing interest in these aspects.
  - **Happiness and Perceptions:**
    These terms start at modest levels but also experience significant increases, reflecting the growing focus on emotional and cognitive dimensions within tourism research.
  - **Attitudes and Impact:**
    The steady rise in these terms suggests that researchers increasingly consider how tourism influences both attitudes and measurable impacts.
  - **Experience, Health, and Model:**
    Although starting lower compared to other terms, the frequency of these words also increases, underscoring an expanding emphasis on experiential, health-related, and methodological dimensions.

- **Notable Increases:**
  A marked increase is visible from 2012 onward, likely reflecting an expanding body of research and the maturation of the field, where more nuanced aspects (such as health, models, and experiential quality) are examined.

Interpretation

- **Emerging and Evolving Themes:**
  The upward trajectory across all key terms indicates a growth in both the quantity and depth of research within the domain.

  - *Quality-of-life* and *satisfaction*—core to understanding the impacts of tourism—have become focal points, reflecting a shift toward evaluating tourism's effects on personal and community well-being.

- The rise in *tourism* itself signals the overall expansion of the field.
- Increased attention to *happiness*, *perceptions*, and *attitudes* suggests that the subjective experiences of tourists and residents are receiving more scholarly attention.
- The growth in the frequency of *model* and related methodological terms highlights the increasing use of sophisticated analytical and statistical methods (e.g., structural equation modeling, pls-sem) to study these phenomena.

- **Maturation of Research:**
  The consistent increase in these key words over time suggests that the field has matured. Early studies laid the foundation, and later research builds on these seminal works to explore more complex, multidimensional issues.

- **Reflecting Broader Trends:**
  The rise in terms like *quality-of-life*, *health*, and *experience* can be linked to broader societal trends —such as a focus on well-being, lifestyle, and the holistic impacts of tourism. Similarly, the use of methodological terms indicates that researchers are continuously improving the rigor and robustness of their analyses.

Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion:

The time-series data of word frequencies clearly illustrate the evolution of research themes in the tourism domain. As the field grows, core themes such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, and tourism have seen substantial increases in their usage. This not only reflects a quantitative growth in publications but also indicates a qualitative shift toward more comprehensive, multidisciplinary inquiries into the effects and implications of tourism.

Summary:

- **Pattern:**

- There is an overall upward trend in the frequency of all key terms from 2001 to 2025. - Early years show very low frequencies, while later years demonstrate robust usage of terms. - **Interpretation:**

- The increasing frequencies of terms like quality-of-life, satisfaction, tourism, and happiness suggest that these are central, evolving themes in the literature. - The growth in methodological and conceptual terms (e.g., model, experience) indicates an evolution toward more sophisticated research designs. - **Overall Insight:**

- The data serve as a "spectroscopic" fingerprint of the field, revealing how foundational themes have grown and diversified over time. This evolution reflects both the expansion of tourism research and its increasing complexity, aligning with broader trends in societal focus on well-being, sustainability, and consumer experience.

This analysis of word frequency over time provides valuable insights into how the research landscape has developed and where future scholarly efforts may be directed.

gt::gt(WordFreqOverTime)

(data/figure/WordFreqOverTime.png)

Trend Topics

Description

- **Wide Range of Topics:**
  The topics span from highly researched themes like *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, and *tourism* to more niche areas such as *casino*, *connectedness*, and *social media*.

- **Temporal Distribution:**

  - **Earlier Appearance:** Some topics, like *mood* and *patterns*, show initial prominence around 2012–2013 with later median and Q3 years indicating continued relevance.
  - **Later Emergence:** Key topics such as *quality-of-life*, *perceptions*, *attitudes*, *satisfaction*, *tourism*, and *happiness* have Q1 values around 2019–2020, with median and Q3 values extending to 2022–2024. This suggests these themes have become central and are driving recent research.
  - **Steady Themes:** Other topics (e.g., *leisure*, *vacation*, *social impacts*) show a steady upward trend with their central tendency positioned in recent years.

- **Frequency Variation:**

  - High-frequency topics (e.g., *quality-of-life* with 371 occurrences and *satisfaction* with 326) indicate major research drivers.
  - Lower-frequency topics (e.g., *casino* with 5 occurrences) may represent more specialized or emerging areas.

Interpretation

- **Evolving Research Priorities:**
  The shift in the median and Q3 years toward the later part of the timeline for many key topics (such as *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, *tourism*, and *happiness*) suggests that the field has increasingly focused on the holistic and experiential aspects of tourism and its broader social and emotional impacts.

- **Emergence of New Areas:**
  Terms like *social media* and *connectedness* appear in the most recent quartiles, reflecting the impact of digital technologies and social networks on tourism research. Similarly, *technology* as a topic, though lower in frequency, is gaining traction in the later years.

- **Consistent Themes:**
  Core topics such as *leisure*, *vacation*, and *travel* have maintained consistent attention over the years, which indicates their foundational role in the research field. Their consistent appearance underscores the importance of understanding both the operational and experiential dimensions of tourism.

- **Implications for Future Research:**
  The data suggest that while traditional topics remain critical, there is a growing interest in integrating digital and social dimensions (e.g., social media, connectedness) and exploring new angles on well-being (quality-of-life, self-determination) within the context of tourism and hospitality.

Conclusion & Summary

Conclusion:

The trend topics analysis reveals a clear evolution in research focus over the years. Traditional themes such as *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, *tourism*, and *happiness* have surged in importance in recent years, while emerging areas such as *social media* and *connectedness* signal the integration of digital dimensions into tourism research.

Summary:

- **Pattern:**

- Many key terms have shifted toward later publication years, with medians and Q3 values in the 2020–2024 range. - High-frequency topics such as *quality-of-life*, *satisfaction*, and *tourism* dominate the recent landscape. - **Interpretation:**

- The data indicate an evolving research focus from traditional tourism metrics to broader, more holistic measures of well-being and digital influence. - The steady rise of topics like *leisure* and *vacation* reinforces their enduring relevance. - **Overall Insight:**

- The trend topics provide a "spectral" view of the field, highlighting both well-established and emerging themes. This evolution reflects the dynamic nature of tourism research as it adapts to societal changes, technological advancements, and new methodological approaches.

gt::gt(TrendTopics)

(data/figure/TrendTopics.png)

Clustering

Clustering by Coupling

Bibliometric coupling occurs when two documents reference a common third document in their bibliographies. It's a method used to understand and visualize the intellectual structure of a scientific field.

- Table1 Parameters:

  - Analysis of Documents using the CR (Cited References) field.
  - The analysis uses a single word (ngram = 1) as a term.
  - The labeling term used is 'ID'.
  - The impact measure is local, meaning the citation scores are specific to this dataset and do not refer to global scores.
  - Stemming is set to false, which means words in their base form were not merged (e.g., 'running', 'runner', and 'ran' are treated as distinct words).
  - The size of 0.3 might refer to the size of the nodes or clusters in a visualization (if one exists).
  - Community repulsion and repel are both set to zero or false, which means there is no repulsion force in the clustering process. This could have implications for the layout of a network visualization.
  - Walktrap is the clustering method used. Walktrap is a method that identifies communities (or clusters) in networks by simulating random walks.

Description

- These parameters tell us that the bibliocoupling analysis focused on a set of 250 documents. Only references cited at least 7 times were considered, and the local citation impact was used to weigh the coupling. The walktrap clustering algorithm was chosen to detect communities (clusters) among documents.

- All the documents in Table 2 are assigned to Cluster 1, indicating that—under the chosen coupling criteria—they share a similar citation footprint. The NormalizedLocalCitationScore gives an idea of each document's local impact within this cluster. Higher scores (for example, above 5) may indicate that these works are central in this group, while lower scores indicate a more peripheral position.

- The labels are created by extracting key words that most frequently appear within the coupled documents. For instance, in Cluster 1 the dominant topics appear to be "quality-of-life," "satisfaction," and "perceptions." The "conf" values (for "confidence") indicate the proportion with which these words characterize the cluster. In Cluster 2, terms such as "satisfaction," "tourism," and "happiness" define the group. The frequency (number of documents or occurrences), centrality (how central this cluster is within the network), and impact (aggregate local impact) help to compare the importance of each cluster. The color codes can be used to visually distinguish clusters in network visualizations.

Interpretation

- Cluster Formation:

– The bibliocoupling analysis shows that a large portion of the 250 documents (as seen in Table 2) belong to a single dominant cluster (Cluster 1), suggesting a high degree of shared references among these works. The cluster is characterized by themes related to quality-of-life, satisfaction, and perceptions—a reflection of a common intellectual basis in tourism and hospitality research.

• Cluster Labels and Themes:

– Table 3 provides a "spectral" overview of clusters by summarizing the key themes. Different clusters (here, four groups are shown) have distinctive profiles:

• Groups

– Group 1: Emphasizes quality-of-life, satisfaction, and perceptions.
– Group 2: Highlights satisfaction, tourism, and happiness.
– Group 3: Focuses on tourism as well as quality-of-life and satisfaction (but with a different balance).
– Group 4: Indicates a blend where quality-of-life and happiness are important alongside satisfaction.

• Application: Such an analysis can help researchers identify the intellectual foundations of the field, pinpoint seminal works, and recognize the evolution of research topics over time. It also facilitates the discovery of potential gaps, emerging clusters, or the need for interdisciplinary bridges.

Conclusion & Summary

In summary, this bibliocoupling analysis—through document clustering—provides a detailed "map" of how research in tourism, quality-of-life, satisfaction, and related fields is interconnected. The parameters (Table 1) set the stage for the analysis, Table 2 shows the membership and impact of individual works within a cluster, and Table 3 synthesizes the thematic essence of each cluster, offering insights into the structure and evolution of the research landscape.

(data/figure/CouplingMap1.png)

(data/figure/CouplingMap2.png)

1717 **Conceptual Structure**

1718 **Network Approach**

1719 **Co-occurence Network**

1720 **Description**

1721   • Cluster 1:

1722   – Includes keywords such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, perceptions, attitudes, impact, support,
1723   management, destination, community, and so forth. These terms emphasize conceptual and
1724   socio-psychological aspects of tourism research (e.g., quality-of-life outcomes, satisfaction con-
1725   structs, community support, and destination management).

1726   • Cluster 2:

1727   – Includes keywords such as tourism, happiness, experience, health, behavior, travel, leisure, mo-
1728   tivation, vacation, hospitality, emotions, service quality, etc.

1729   • These terms tend to focus on traveler-centric topics such as tourist behavior, happiness, well-being,
1730   and experiential dimensions of tourism and hospitality.
1731   • Each node is measured by three main centrality metrics:

1732   – Betweenness: How often a keyword lies on the shortest path between two other keywords. High
1733   betweenness = strong "bridging" or "brokerage" role.
1734   – Closeness: How close a keyword is to all other keywords in the network. High closeness = the
1735   keyword can quickly "reach" many others.
1736   – PageRank: A measure of overall importance or influence in the network. High PageRank = a
1737   keyword is frequently linked or co-occurs with other influential terms.

1738 **Interpretation**

1739   1. Cluster 1 Highlights

1740   • Quality-of-life (Betweenness = 71.51, PageRank = 0.0720)

1741   – This has the highest betweenness and highest PageRank in the entire network, indicating it is a
1742   major "bridge" and a core concept.
1743   – High betweenness means quality-of-life connects multiple subtopics, bridging them within
1744   tourism research.
1745   – High PageRank underscores its frequent and influential co-occurrences with other key words
1746   like satisfaction, perceptions, and attitudes.

1747   • Satisfaction (Betweenness = 61.36, PageRank = 0.0684)

1748   – Another highly central term, signifying it often co-occurs with quality-of-life and perceptions.
1749   – Its role in bridging subtopics is second only to quality-of-life, reflecting the strong interplay
1750   between satisfaction constructs and broader tourism impacts.

- Perceptions (Betweenness = 22.47, PageRank = 0.0441) and Attitudes (Betweenness = 19.09, PageRank = 0.0420)

    - Both show moderate to high betweenness and are conceptually linked to how stakeholders (e.g., residents, tourists) perceive tourism's impacts and outcomes.
    - They often appear in studies focusing on local community or tourist viewpoints.

- Impact / Impacts (Betweenness ~16, PageRank ~0.03)

    - Reiterates the thematic emphasis on understanding how tourism affects communities, well-being, and destination development.

- In sum, Cluster 1 focuses on macro-level and conceptual themes such as quality-of-life, satisfaction, and stakeholder perceptions. The high bridging role of quality-of-life and satisfaction suggests these are pivotal, unifying concepts in tourism research.

2. Cluster 2 Highlights

- Tourism (Betweenness = 29.29, PageRank = 0.0445) and Happiness (Betweenness = 28.09, PageRank = 0.0453)

    - These have the highest betweenness in Cluster 2, indicating they frequently link subtopics related to personal well-being, experiences, and behavior.

- Experience / Experiences (Betweenness ~14, PageRank ~0.0317) and Health (Betweenness ~8.62, PageRank ~0.0292)

    - Emphasize the experiential and well-being dimensions of tourism.
    - Experience is a core bridging term for traveler-centric research, while health underscores the growing interest in wellness, mental health, and stress recovery.

- Behavior (Betweenness = 5.54, PageRank = 0.0224), Travel (Betweenness = 3.64, PageRank = 0.0202), Leisure (Betweenness = 3.37, PageRank = 0.0205)

    - Reflect the micro-level, individual consumer or traveler perspective—motivation, behavior, and leisure patterns.

- Hospitality, Service Quality, Loyalty, Customer Satisfaction

    - These terms highlight the hospitality management dimension within tourism, focusing on how service experiences influence consumer loyalty and satisfaction.

- Overall, Cluster 2 is more oriented toward traveler well-being, emotions, experiences, and behavioral outcomes (e.g., loyalty, motivation, and health benefits). Tourism and happiness stand out as bridging concepts linking different aspects of the tourist experience and personal well-being.

Conclusion & Summary

1. Two Thematic Cores:

- Cluster 1: Macro-level constructs—quality-of-life, satisfaction, and perceptions—dominate. They connect strongly with impacts, community, management, and destination themes.

- Cluster 2: Micro-level or traveler-centric themes—tourism, happiness, experience, health, and be-havior—are central, highlighting well-being, motivation, leisure, and service quality.

2. Most Influential Terms:

- Quality-of-life leads in betweenness and PageRank, serving as a key integrative concept bridging other themes.
- Satisfaction, tourism, and happiness also show high centrality, indicating they frequently co-occur with many keywords and serve as important nodes in the network.

3. Conceptual Bridge:

- The co-word network shows that quality-of-life (Cluster 1) and tourism / happiness (Cluster 2) are ma-jor "bridges," connecting socio-psychological aspects (perceptions, attitudes, impacts) with personal experience dimensions (health, motivation, leisure).

4. Practical Implication:

- Researchers focusing on policy and strategic planning may gravitate toward Cluster 1 concepts (e.g., quality-of-life, satisfaction, community impacts).

- Scholars exploring traveler behavior, well-being, and experiential marketing will likely anchor in Cluster 2 (tourism, happiness, experience, health).

- Conclusion:

  - The co-word network reveals two robust thematic poles in tourism research: one anchored in quality-of-life and satisfaction at the macro/community level, and the other in tourism, happi-ness, and health at the traveler experience level. High-betweenness terms (e.g., quality-of-life, satisfaction, tourism, happiness) serve as critical links across subfields, indicating these key-words are central to the ongoing dialogue in tourism and hospitality scholarship.

gt::gt(CoWordNet)

(data/figure/CoWordNet.png)

Thematic Map

Based on the provided data, it appears to be a bibliometric analysis of the term. Bibliometric analysis is used to quantify and analyze published literature on a particular topic, often to identify the most prevalent themes, authors, and journals. The data seems to be organized in a thematic map, detailing the occurrences and relevance of certain words or terms associated with the topic.

Description

The Thematic Map positions each cluster according to two metrics:

Callon Centrality: How important or "central" a cluster is to the entire research domain. High centrality indicates the cluster is well-connected and influences many other themes. Callon Density: How internally cohesive or "dense" a cluster is. High density indicates the cluster's themes are well-developed and strongly

interconnected. Additionally, the bubble size corresponds to the frequency of topics within that cluster (i.e., how often these topics appear in the dataset).

From the table:

Cluster	Callon Centrality	Callon Density	Rank Centrality	Rank Density	Frequency
Health	2.91	13.25	3	4	1932
Satisfaction	5.24	10.38	4	2	3244
Perceptions	1.99	10.76	2	3	1461
Quality-of-Life	1.78	9.51	1	1	866

- Cluster 1: Health has high density (13.25) but moderate centrality (2.91).
- Cluster 2: Satisfaction stands out for having the highest centrality (5.24) and a relatively high density (10.38).
- Cluster 3: Perceptions shows moderate centrality (1.99) and density (10.76).
- Cluster 4: Quality-of-Life has lower centrality (1.78) and density (9.51), as well as the smallest frequency (866).

Interpretation

1. Health

- Density (13.25): Indicates a well-developed, cohesive set of themes.
- Centrality (2.91): The cluster is moderately influential within the overall research landscape.
- Frequency (1932): There is a substantial volume of research, covering:

    – Well-being, mental health, stress, physical activity, wellness tourism, and vacation benefits.
    – Topics such as positive psychology, life satisfaction, stress, self-determination, and burnout frequently appear.

- Interpretation: Although not the most central cluster, "Health" is deeply explored and internally cohesive. It serves as a significant subfield, possibly appealing to scholars studying tourism's role in stress reduction, wellness experiences, and overall well-being.

2. Satisfaction

- Density (10.38): Well-developed but not as dense as "Health."
- Centrality (5.24): The highest among all clusters, indicating it is a key bridging concept for the entire domain.
- Frequency (3244): The largest volume of research. Core themes include:

    – Consumer behavior, service quality, tourism experience, loyalty, behavioral intentions, motivation, and hospitality management.
    – The presence of strong "experience" and "modeling" keywords indicates robust quantitative and conceptual frameworks analyzing satisfaction-related outcomes.

- Interpretation: "Satisfaction" is pivotal to the domain. It connects to many other themes (e.g., loyalty, experience, perceived value), making it a central hub in tourism and hospitality research.

3. Perceptions

- Density (10.76): Similar to "Satisfaction" in density, indicating strong internal links.
- Centrality (1.99): Somewhat lower centrality compared to "Satisfaction," but not marginal.
- Frequency (1461): Moderately sized. Key themes:

    – Attitudes, community perceptions, residents' support, sustainable tourism, social impacts, and management aspects.
    – Emphasis on how locals, communities, and stakeholders perceive tourism's impacts.

- Interpretation: "Perceptions" focuses on stakeholder attitudes (especially residents), community-level impacts, and sustainability. Its moderate centrality suggests it is more specialized than "Satisfaction" but remains an important dimension of tourism research.

4. Quality-of-Life

- Density (9.51): The lowest density, indicating it is less internally cohesive compared to the others.
- Centrality (1.78): Also relatively low, meaning it is less connected to other clusters.
- Frequency (866): The smallest cluster, yet thematically crucial. Key topics:

    – Socio-economic impacts, well-being research, policy aspects, urban tourism, and city contexts.
    – Terms like "heritage," "choice," "innovation," and "rural tourism" appear, suggesting a broad range but less internal overlap.

- Interpretation: "Quality-of-Life" is foundational to tourism's broader socio-economic discourse, linking well-being to policy and development. Despite lower centrality and density, it remains a conceptually important area, especially for strategic and policy-driven studies.

Conclusion & Summary

- Health (high density, moderate centrality): A strongly developed cluster focusing on well-being, mental health, stress, and physical activity in tourism contexts.
- Satisfaction (highest centrality, well-developed density): The dominant cluster bridging various subfields in tourism and hospitality—centered on consumer satisfaction, loyalty, and experience.
- Perceptions (moderate centrality, moderate-high density): Focused on stakeholder attitudes, community impacts, and sustainability. Emphasizes how local communities and other stakeholders perceive tourism's effects.
- Quality-of-Life (lowest centrality and density, smaller size): Addresses broader socio-economic outcomes, well-being research, and policy concerns, providing a more macro-level perspective on how tourism influences overall life quality.
- The Satisfaction cluster emerges as the most central—meaning it touches many other areas of tourism research—while Health is the most internally cohesive (highest density). Perceptions occupies a mid-range position, suggesting it is well-studied but less of a "bridge" than Satisfaction. Quality-of-Life appears more specialized, with fewer interconnections but important for strategic policy insights.
- The thematic analysis reveals four major research clusters in the field: Health, Satisfaction, Perceptions, and Quality-of-Life.
- Satisfaction is the key bridging concept in tourism and hospitality studies, connecting with consumer behavior, loyalty, service quality, and experience-driven research.

- Health is a well-established, highly cohesive cluster focusing on wellness and well-being, indicating a strong niche of scholarship.
- Perceptions revolve around how stakeholders and communities view tourism, highlighting attitudes, community support, and sustainable tourism.
- Quality-of-Life stands out for exploring policy, socio-economic, and macro-level impacts, though it is less interconnected with other clusters.
- Overall, these four clusters collectively structure the tourism and hospitality research landscape, reflecting both micro-level topics (e.g., satisfaction, well-being) and macro-level considerations (e.g., community perceptions, quality-of-life, policy). Future research may benefit from integrating these clusters, for instance, examining how quality-of-life outcomes tie into satisfaction drivers, or how community perceptions intersect with health-related tourism experiences.

(data/figure/ThematicMap.png)

Factorial Approach

Factorial Analysis

Factorial analysis is a statistical method used to identify the underlying relationships among a set of variables. Here, you've presented data for words (probably representing research themes or keywords) and documents (probably representing research papers) in two different dimensions (Dim.1 and Dim.2).

Description

- In our dataset, 50+ keywords (e.g., "quality.of.life", "satisfaction", "tourism", "happiness", "perceptions", etc.) were subjected to a factor analysis. Two factors (here labeled Dim1 and Dim2) emerged that account for a major part of the variance in the keywords' co-occurrence patterns. For example:

    - Quality.of.life shows a strong negative loading on Dim1 (–0.85) and near zero on Dim2.
    - Attitudes and perceptions both load very negatively on Dim1 (–1.63 and –1.15, respectively), while other terms such as support (–1.86) and sustainable.tourism (–1.87) are also strongly negative on Dim1.
    - In contrast, words such as vacation (1.05 on Dim1 and 1.16 on Dim2), health (0.81, 0.87), leisure (0.81, 0.97) and life (0.96, 0.17) show strong positive values—especially on Dim1.
    - Some terms are more prominent on Dim2: for example, happiness (0.47, 0.58) and experiences (0.5, 0.69) suggest an important emotional/experiential component.

- Each keyword's coordinates on these two dimensions is thought to reflect underlying "latent" factors in how topics are discussed in the literature.

Interpretation

Although interpretation in factor analysis can be somewhat subjective, the pattern of loadings suggests the following:

- Dimension 1: "Value & Appraisal versus Critical/Contextual Factors"

    - High positive loadings (e.g., "vacation," "life," "health," "leisure") indicate terms that are typically associated with positive experiential outcomes and well‐being.
    - High negative loadings (e.g., "perceptions," "attitudes," "support," "sustainable.tourism") indicate concepts that may capture evaluative or critical aspects (for example, community or stakeholder concerns, or constructs that question the status quo).
    - In essence, Dim1 appears to differentiate research that emphasizes the positive, beneficial, or "value‐adding" aspects of tourism from work that focuses on critical or challenging perspectives (or even on the underlying cognitive–affective appraisals of tourism impacts).

- Dimension 2: "Emotional-Experiential Intensity versus Structural/Process Aspects"

    - Higher scores on Dim2 (e.g., "happiness," "experiences," "leisure," "benefits") suggest a focus on the intensity of affect, emotion, or subjective experience.
    - In contrast, keywords such as "model," "service.quality," "behavioral.intentions," and "loyalty"—which load more strongly in the negative direction on Dim2—may be more concerned with evaluative, outcome‐oriented, or structural aspects of tourism research.

– Thus, Dim2 can be seen as contrasting research that emphasizes the affective, emotional, and experiential side of tourism versus work that is more about measurement models, process evaluations, and outcome indicators.

Conclusion & Summary

- Two key dimensions emerged from the factor analysis on tourism–related keywords.

  – Dimension 1 appears to capture a continuum from positive experiential and well–being aspects (e.g., "vacation," "health," "leisure," "life") to more evaluative or critical constructs (e.g., "attitudes," "perceptions," "support," "sustainable.tourism").
  – Dimension 2 seems to distinguish between emotionally charged, experiential concepts (e.g., "happiness," "experiences") and those keywords that are more process☐ or model–oriented (e.g., "model," "behavioral.intentions," "service.quality").
  – All keywords included in this analysis were part of a single cluster (Cluster 1), indicating that while there is one overall thematic grouping in the literature, two latent dimensions underlie how these themes interrelate.

- Conclusion:

  – The factor analysis reveals that within tourism research the scholarly discourse can be understood along two interrelated axes. One axis (Dim1) differentiates between constructs related to positive outcomes and quality of life versus those that reflect critical perceptions and contextual challenges. The other axis (Dim2) highlights the distinction between the intensity of emotional and experiential aspects and more structural, model-based, or outcome–focused measures.
  – This dual☐dimensional structure underscores the multifaceted nature of tourism research. Researchers and practitioners can use these insights to:
    * Better understand which concepts are central to different research traditions (e.g., studies of well–being versus evaluations of tourism impacts).
    * Guide future investigations by clarifying which aspects (emotional vs. structural, positive vs. critical) remain underexplored or in need of deeper theoretical integration.
    * Inform policy and management decisions by recognizing that both subjective well–being and structural performance indicators are critical in evaluating the success and sustainability of tourism initiatives.

In summary, the latent dimensions identified through the factor analysis provide a nuanced picture of how keywords cluster around themes of quality-of-life and satisfaction, while also highlighting the role of emotional experience versus evaluative modeling in tourism research. This enhanced understanding can help orient future research and interdisciplinary dialogue within the field.

(data/figure/FactorialAnalysis1.png)

(data/figure/FactorialAnalysis2.png)

Intellectual Structure

Co-citation Network

Description

Network Structure and Clusters:

- Cluster 1: This group includes documents such as Mccabe et al. (2013), Gilbert (2004), Smith (2017), Sirgy (2011), and several others. These works generally have moderate to low betweenness values (e.g., betweenness ranging from about 0.3 to 8) and closeness values around 0.012–0.015. Their PageRank scores (ranging roughly from 0.01 to 0.03) indicate that while they are cited together and contribute to a cohesive group, they are not the highest "bridging" documents in the network.

- Cluster 2: Starting with nodes such as Kim K (2013), Andereck KL (2011), Woo E (2015), and others, Cluster 2 documents show very high betweenness values (e.g., 14–15 and even up to 27 in some cases) and relatively high closeness (around 0.014–0.017). Their PageRank scores (up to 0.036) indicate that these documents play a key role in linking various subfields or subtopics. This cluster likely represents a group of seminal or central works that many later studies reference together.

- Cluster 3: The third cluster (which begins with Fornell (1981) and includes Uysal (2016), Hair (2010), Podsakoff (2003), etc.) has very high betweenness values (for instance, Fornell's betweenness is over 130) and higher closeness values (around 0.017–0.019). Their PageRank scores are also higher (up to 0.03 or more). This cluster appears to capture highly influential and broadly recognized works that serve as intellectual hubs in the tourism literature.

Centrality Measures:

- Betweenness Centrality: This measure reflects how often a document lies on the shortest path between other documents. Documents with high betweenness (e.g., those in Cluster 3) are considered "bridges" between different parts of the network, indicating they are crucial for connecting diverse research streams.
- Closeness Centrality: This value shows how close a document is to all other documents in the network. Most documents have closeness values in the narrow range (~0.012–0.019), suggesting that while there are differences, the network is relatively compact.
- PageRank: Higher PageRank values (e.g., those for some Cluster 3 documents) indicate that those papers are not only well‑cited but also cited by other well‑cited documents, underlining their broader influence within the literature.

Interpretation

- Distinct Intellectual Communities: The emergence of three clusters indicates that the field of tourism research is divided into at least three distinct intellectual communities or subfields. Each cluster groups together articles that tend to be cited together, suggesting that they share common themes or theoretical frameworks.

- Influence and Bridging Roles: Documents in Cluster 3 (with very high betweenness and PageRank) appear to serve as key bridges, likely representing foundational or methodological works that have influenced multiple strands of tourism research. In contrast, Cluster 1 documents may be more specialized or represent a more coherent niche, while Cluster 2 contains influential works that are central to connecting topics within that niche.

- Role of Seminal Works: For instance, Fornell's (1981) work in Cluster 3 has an exceptionally high betweenness centrality, marking it as a pivotal reference that links diverse research areas. Similarly, high betweenness scores in Cluster 2 (e.g., for Kim K (2013) and Andereck KL (2011)) suggest that these studies have had a substantial impact on subsequent research and are frequently co-cited with a wide range of other documents.

Conclusion & Summary

The co-citation network analysis reveals a structured landscape in tourism research where:

- Cluster 1 comprises documents that form a specialized but cohesive group with moderate centrality values.
- Cluster 2 consists of influential works that serve as important connectors within a subfield, having high betweenness and relatively high PageRank scores.
- Cluster 3 includes seminal and widely influential documents that act as intellectual hubs, connecting diverse research streams across the field.

Conclusion: The network structure underscores the multidimensional nature of tourism research. High-centrality documents—particularly those in Cluster 3—are key for bridging theoretical, methodological, and empirical studies, thereby facilitating cross-fertilization between different research areas. In contrast, Cluster 1 and Cluster 2 represent more thematically coherent or specialized sub-communities. Recognizing these clusters and the roles of the central documents can guide researchers in identifying core literature, understanding the evolution of the field, and pinpointing potential areas for future interdisciplinary integration. This co-citation analysis ultimately highlights both the diversity and the interconnectedness of scholarly work in tourism research.

gt::gt(CoCitNet)

(data/figure/CoCitNet.png)

Historiograph

Description

1. Co-Citation Network In the co-citation network, individual documents are represented as nodes and the frequency with which they are cited together forms the links between them. Key metrics —betweenness, closeness, and PageRank—help us gauge the influence and connectivity of each publication.

- Clusters and Influential Works:

- The network reveals several distinct clusters (in our sample, clusters "1", "2", and "3") that represent different intellectual sub-communities within the literature. For example, documents such as Fornell (1981), Uysal (2016), and Hair (2010) in Cluster 3 have exceptionally high betweenness and PageRank scores. These works are central bridging documents that are not only well cited themselves but also frequently cited together with other influential studies. Their high betweenness indicates that they connect diverse parts of the network, suggesting that they serve as foundational references that have shaped multiple strands of research.

- Centrality Measures:

  - Betweenness Centrality shows the role of a document as an intermediary between other works. Higher values (as seen with Fornell and Uysal) imply that these papers act as important conduits through which ideas and methods disseminate. Closeness Centrality indicates how near a document is to all others in the network, with most values clustering in a narrow band. This implies that, while differences exist, the network is relatively compact.
  - PageRank reflects the overall "prestige" or influence of a paper. Documents with higher PageRank, particularly in Cluster 3, are influential in the sense that they are cited by other highly cited works.
  - Overall, the co‑citation analysis suggests that seminal publications serve as intellectual hubs. They not only anchor their respective subfields but also bridge across them, facilitating the diffusion of ideas in the broader domain of tourism, quality of life, and well‑being research.

2. Factorial Analysis on Keywords The factorial analysis on keywords investigates the underlying dimensions that organize the intellectual content of the field. In the provided table:

- Dimensions (Factors):

  - The keywords have been projected onto two dimensions (Dim1 and Dim2) that capture patterns of co‑occurrence and semantic similarity across the literature. For instance:
  - Keywords such as "quality.of.life", "perceptions", "attitudes", "support", "impacts" show strong negative loadings on the first dimension. This grouping may represent a critical or evaluative dimension in which the literature focuses on the challenges or complexities of assessing quality of life and subjective well‑being.
  - In contrast, keywords such as "happiness", "health", "experiences", "leisure", "benefits", "vacation", and "positive.psychology" tend to have positive loadings on the first and second dimensions. This pattern suggests a complementary perspective emphasizing the positive and experiential aspects of tourism and its contribution to well‑being.

- Thematic Grouping:

  - The factorial solution appears to cluster together terms that reflect both the evaluative (e.g., perceptions, attitudes, and negative aspects like stress or constraints) and the experiential (e.g., happiness, health, leisure, and benefits) sides of the literature. This dual structure underscores the multidimensionality of research in tourism: while some works scrutinize the challenges and potential negative impacts (or the critical evaluation of quality-of-life metrics), others highlight the positive outcomes and benefits that travel and leisure experiences can offer.

- Document Contributions:

– A complementary analysis of documents (Table 2) shows how individual papers load on these dimensions. Papers with strong positive contributions might represent research that emphasizes the uplifting and beneficial outcomes of travel experiences, whereas those with negative loadings may address challenges, limitations, or areas for improvement in assessing tourism's impact on quality of life.

Conclusion & Summary

The combined analyses reveal a rich, interconnected intellectual landscape in tourism and well‑being research:

- Co‑citation Network:

  – The network structure, through its clusters and centrality measures, indicates that the field is anchored by several seminal works—especially in Cluster 3—that serve as critical hubs linking diverse research streams. These influential documents act as bridges, disseminating ideas across the field and underpinning both methodological and conceptual advances. Meanwhile, other clusters represent more specialized thematic groups that address specific aspects of tourism's impact on quality of life.

- Factorial Analysis on Keywords:

  – The keyword analysis uncovers two main dimensions that represent opposing yet complementary perspectives. One dimension is characterized by critical evaluative terms (such as negative perceptions, stress, or constraints) while the other highlights the positive, experiential outcomes (including happiness, health, leisure, and benefits). This duality reflects the inherent complexity of tourism research, where studies balance assessments of both the challenges and the enriching aspects of travel experiences.

- Conclusion:

  – Taken together, these analyses demonstrate that tourism research is multifaceted—both in its intellectual structure and in its thematic content. The co‑citation network identifies key publications that have significantly influenced the field and act as linchpins connecting various research areas. Simultaneously, the factorial analysis of keywords reveals a nuanced interplay between critical evaluation and the celebration of positive experiences. Recognizing these patterns can help researchers, practitioners, and policymakers better understand the evolution of the field, identify core literature and emerging trends, and foster further interdisciplinary integration. This comprehensive insight supports more informed decisions in research direction, policy formulation, and the practical application of tourism and well‑being studies.

gt::gt(Historiograph)

(data/figure/Historiograph.png)

Social Structure

Collaboration Network

The given data presents a bibliometric analysis of the author collaboration network on the topic. The metrics included are betweenness, closeness, and PageRank. Let's delve into an interpretation of the results:

Description

The collaboration network represents how authors are connected through co□authorship relationships. Each node is an individual researcher, and the network is partitioned into several clusters (labeled here by numbers). In this dataset, nodes are characterized by several centrality measures:

- Betweenness Centrality: Indicates an author's role as a "bridge" or connector between otherwise separate parts of the network. High betweenness suggests that an author plays a key role in linking different collaboration groups.
- Closeness Centrality: Reflects how "close" an author is to all other authors in the network. A higher closeness value means that the author is well□positioned to quickly interact or share information with others.
- PageRank: Captures the overall "influence" or prestige of the author within the network, taking into account not only the number but also the importance of collaborators.

The network is divided into several clusters (e.g., Cluster 1, Cluster 2, Cluster 3, etc.), suggesting that researchers tend to collaborate within certain groups. For example, Cluster 1 includes nodes like Zhang Y, Gao J, Lee TJ, and Chen CC, while Cluster 2 is characterized by authors such as Kim S, Lee CK, Han H, and Ramkissoon H.

Interpretation

1. Key Connectors and Influencers:

- Zhang Y (Cluster 1) shows the highest betweenness in its cluster ($\approx$72.67), which means that this author often serves as a bridge between otherwise disconnected groups. In addition, a high PageRank ($\approx$0.0346) further underscores Zhang Y's influential position.
- In Cluster 2, authors like Kim S, Lee CK, Han H, and Ramkissoon H also have high betweenness values and relatively high closeness scores, indicating that this group is not only tightly knit but also well connected to other parts of the network.
- Uysal M in Cluster 10 stands out with a high betweenness of about 74.31 and an impressive PageRank of nearly 0.06, suggesting that Uysal is a central figure in a distinct collaboration sub□community, acting as both a hub and a bridge to other groups.

2. Cluster Characteristics:

- Clusters 1 and 2 appear to be the most densely interconnected, with multiple nodes exhibiting similar closeness and PageRank values. These clusters likely represent established research groups or long□standing collaborative networks in the field.

- Clusters with lower node counts or with nodes showing very low betweenness (for example, some nodes in Clusters 4 or 5 where betweenness is 0) may represent peripheral groups or newer collaborations that are not yet well integrated into the broader network.

3. Overall Connectivity:

- The variation in closeness centrality (ranging roughly from 0.005 to 0.012 in most cases) suggests that, on average, authors are not very "distant" from each other—indicating a relatively compact network structure. This compactness can facilitate the rapid dissemination of ideas and collaborative practices across the field.
- PageRank scores, although varying, help identify which authors are cited or recognized frequently by other influential authors. For instance, Uysal M's relatively high PageRank in Cluster 10 is indicative of his significant impact within that sub-community.

Conclusion & Summary

The collaboration network reveals a multi☐cluster structure, highlighting both well☐established research groups and more peripheral or emerging clusters. Key authors such as Zhang Y (Cluster 1), Kim S (Cluster 2), and Uysal M (Cluster 10) act as critical connectors and influencers within their groups. High betweenness and PageRank values for these nodes indicate that they not only facilitate collaborations within their own clusters but also serve as bridges to other parts of the network. Closeness centrality values show that most authors are relatively near to one another in terms of collaborative reach, reinforcing the notion of a densely interconnected research community.

- Conclusion:

    - The analysis of the collaboration network provides valuable insights into the structure and dynamics of research collaboration in this domain. Key findings include:

        * The presence of distinct collaboration clusters, each with its own set of influential authors.
        * Several central figures (high betweenness and PageRank) play pivotal roles in connecting disparate groups, suggesting that fostering collaborations with these individuals could enhance interdisciplinary and cross☐cluster research.
        * The relatively compact nature of the network implies that innovations and methodological advancements can spread rapidly through these collaborations.

Overall, the collaboration network reflects a vibrant and interconnected research community. By identifying the key players and understanding the collaborative structure, researchers and decision☐makers can better design strategies for knowledge sharing, resource allocation, and the promotion of interdisciplinary studies.

gt::gt(CollabNet[25:70,1:4])

(data/figure/CollabNet.png)

Countries' Collaboration World Map

The dataset offers a broad view of the collaborations between countries in the field. The frequencies indicate the number of times scholars from two countries have co-authored papers. In this case, the majority of collaborations have a frequency of 1, meaning that many pairs of countries have collaborated once.

Description

1. High-Frequency Links

   • China → USA (91 collaborations) is by far the most frequently observed connection, indicating a very strong research or project link between these two countries.
   • China → Australia (65) and Australia → United Kingdom (14) also stand out, suggesting that these triads (China–USA, China–Australia, and Australia–UK) form a major hub of collaboration.
   • The United Kingdom → South Africa (15) and Australia → South Africa (11) links highlight substantial ties between parts of Europe, Oceania, and Africa.

2. Regional Clusters

   • The table shows many intra-Asia or Asia–Pacific collaborations: for instance, Australia with various Asia-Pacific nations (e.g., Malaysia, New Zealand, Korea) and China with countries like Korea, Malaysia, and Japan.
   • There are also strong Europe-based clusters. For instance, Finland has multiple connections to Germany, Sweden, Estonia, etc., and Spain has multiple links across Europe (Portugal, France, Germany, etc.).

3. North–South Collaborations

   • The data indicates many cross-hemisphere partnerships, such as: USA collaborating with countries in Africa (South Africa, Ghana, Egypt) and Latin America (Mexico, Chile).
   • United Kingdom partnering with countries in Asia (India, Malaysia, Thailand), the Middle East (Oman, Saudi Arabia), and Africa (South Africa, Ghana).

4. Notable Emerging Collaborations

   • Some countries that might not be as frequently highlighted in global research contexts appear here with multiple ties, e.g., Pakistan, Oman, and Rwanda, each collaborating with various countries.
   • Countries such as Vietnam and Indonesia show collaborations across multiple continents, including Europe, Asia, and Oceania.

Interpretation

   • Major Global Hubs

       – USA, China, Australia, and the United Kingdom appear to be central hubs in this network. They have numerous high-frequency links spanning different continents, suggesting a broad international footprint in collaborative work.

   • Strong Asia–Pacific Ties

    – Collaboration among China, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Malaysia, and others in this region is robust. This reflects a well-connected research environment in the Asia–Pacific.

- Europe's Multiple Clusters

    – Many European countries (e.g., Finland, Germany, Spain, Portugal) have wide-reaching collaborations both within Europe and internationally (Latin America, Africa, and Asia).

- Africa's Rising Presence

    – South Africa stands out as a key collaborator in Africa, linking with the UK, USA, Malaysia, Norway, and more. There are also smaller but noteworthy collaborations involving countries like Ghana, Ethiopia, Rwanda, and Mauritius.

- Opportunities for New Links

    – While some country pairs show strong existing collaboration, others appear only once, indicating potential for expansion. Low-frequency edges might be starting points for growing cross-national research partnerships.

Conclusion & Summary

- This collaboration dataset reveals a complex, global network of partnerships. Certain countries, such as China, USA, Australia, and the United Kingdom, dominate with many high-frequency collaborations. Regions like Asia–Pacific and Europe show strong intra-regional and inter-regional links, while African and Latin American countries also appear as strategic partners in multiple contexts.

- Overall, the data underscores the highly interconnected nature of global research and project collaborations. It can guide future policy decisions, research funding, and institution-level strategies aiming to foster international partnerships and bridge any existing gaps in the global network.

gt::gt(CollabWorldMap %>% filter(Frequency >= 3))

(data/figure/CollabWorldMap.png)

Discussion of the bibliometrics

The analysis report (Chae, 2025a) offers a comprehensive bibliometric examination of the literature on tourists' experiences and happiness. It employs performance indicators, co-citation analyses, and thematic mappings to reveal publication trends, identify influential authors and journals, and elucidate the conceptual and intellectual structures that define this research domain. Overall, it shows an initial, gradual increase in publications in the early 2000s, followed by a sharp rise in recent years, signaling widespread scholarly and societal interest in how tourism intersects with well-being. Older publications consistently demonstrate higher citation counts, reflecting their foundational impact. Key journals such as Tourism Management, Journal of Travel Research, and Journal of Sustainable Tourism play a central role in disseminating significant findings, while researchers like Uysal, Filep, and Kim appear repeatedly as leading figures, suggesting a concentration of expertise and influence. The analysis also highlights extensive international collaboration—spanning China, the United States, and Australia—underscoring the global scope of tourism research and the multifaceted ways it addresses quality of life, subjective well-being, and holistic travel experiences. Two principal thematic clusters emerge. One focuses on macro-level constructs such as quality of life, community impacts, and satisfaction, while the other centers on micro-level, traveler-centric themes such as health, happiness, and experiential outcomes. Factor analysis adds nuance to these findings, indicating that hedonic (pleasure-oriented) and eudaimonic (meaning-oriented) perspectives both occupy prominent positions in scholarly discussions of tourist well-being.

- Relevant Arguments Findings shows emphasizing the need to move beyond tourism's economic or recreational aspects and to integrate subjective well-being and life satisfaction into the scholarly lens. The proposal advocates a holistic, interdisciplinary framework that brings together psychology, economics, sociology, and management to study hedonic and eudaimonic aspects. Similarly, the analysis report indicates that tourism studies are increasingly investigating subjective constructs such as quality of life, satisfaction, and happiness, although these efforts sometimes remain fragmented and isolated. Both sources suggest that comprehensive research on tourism and happiness has the potential to shape more robust policies, industry practices, and cross-disciplinary collaborations that can improve overall quality of life for travelers and host communities.

- Research Questions and Finidngs

  - RQ1: Do Tourism Experiences Enhance Subjective Well-Being? The proposal posits that tourism positively influences subjective well-being, asserting that travel boosts happiness and life satisfaction. The analysis report (Chae, 2025a) confirms that many studies document heightened happiness around trips, a phenomenon sometimes termed the "vacation effect." It does, however, highlight that this uplift may be short-lived, with happiness levels eventually reverting to baseline. Nonetheless, it also notes that certain meaningful or "eudaimonic" travel experiences can create deeper and longer-lasting gains. These findings validate the proposal's fundamental assumption about a positive tourism–happiness link but also stress that duration and intensity of the benefit depend on how and why people travel.

  - RQ2: Which Factors in Tourism Experiences Most Influence Happiness? The proposal underscores factors like destination quality, enjoyment, and safety as primary drivers of tourist happiness. In alignment with this view, the bibliometric analysis pinpoints environmental quality, destination image, risk perception, and authenticity of the travel experience as central to

well-being (Chae, 2025a). Overcrowding is identified as a negative influence, especially under conditions of overtourism. In addition, the discussion of safety—particularly in light of global health events—underscores the importance of contextual variables. These observations reinforce the proposal's argument while broadening its scope: beyond mere enjoyment or good service, factors like social environment and health-related safeguards are indispensable for ensuring a truly satisfying trip.

– RQ3: How Do Scholars Conceptualize and Measure Tourist Happiness? The proposal suggests a positive-psychology framework incorporating both hedonic and eudaimonic dimensions. The analysis report (Chae, 2025a) shows that the field largely adopts Diener's (1984) Subjective Well-Being constructs, blending positive affect, negative affect, and cognitive life satisfaction. Measures such as the Life Satisfaction Scale frequently appear, reflecting a primarily subjective, survey-based methodology. Many researchers also explore deeper, purpose-driven experiences, thus affirming the proposal's view that happiness is more than a fleeting emotion; rather, it can involve personal growth and meaning. These findings confirm that tourism scholars prioritize psychological scales and models of well-being, lending empirical support to the proposal's approach.

– RQ4: What Are the Major Research Gaps and Future Directions? The proposal argues that tourism-happiness research remains fragmented and requires interdisciplinary integration. The bibliometric analysis confirms this fragmentation while identifying trends such as sustainability, technology-driven experiences, and global risk factors (Chae, 2025a). Sustainability issues appear increasingly central, as do the psychological and behavioral effects of crises like the COVID-19 pandemic. Emerging questions also concern digital tourism and how online platforms can shape or mediate tourist well-being. These gaps and emerging foci echo the proposal's call for an integrative framework that spans economics, sociology, public health, and psychology. The analysis thereby extends the proposal's recommendations by highlighting specific under-studied domains—particularly the long-term psychological consequences of travel disruptions and the evolving influence of virtual reality on tourist experiences.

Discussio Points

Relevant Arguments: Both documents assert that tourism goes well beyond its traditional role as a recreational or economic activity. The analysis report demonstrates—with extensive performance, network, and thematic mapping analyses—that research in tourism is increasingly concerned with how travel experiences shape subjective well-being, quality of life, and overall happiness. In parallel, the proposal argues that the field remains fragmented, with isolated studies examining hedonic (pleasure-focused) versus eudaimonic (meaning-focused) aspects. Together, they build a case for a more holistic understanding of tourism's multifaceted impact on human well-being. This perspective is essential as it calls for integrating both psychological and socio-economic dimensions to inform policy, practice, and further academic inquiry.

Potential Research Questions: Drawing on the identified gaps and emerging trends, several research questions naturally arise: ● How do distinct travel experiences differentially influence hedonic and eudaimonic well-being? ● What psychological mechanisms mediate the relationship between tourism and

overall quality of life? ● In what ways do demographic, cultural, and digital factors (e.g., the role of virtual reality) moderate the impact of tourism on happiness? ● How can integrated bibliometric and qualitative methodologies further refine our understanding of the evolving intellectual structure in tourism research?

Interdisciplinary Implications: Both documents highlight the inherently interdisciplinary nature of studying tourism and happiness. By merging perspectives from positive psychology, economics, sociology, and management, the research field is poised to develop richer, more nuanced models of well-being. This interdisciplinary approach not only enhances theoretical development but also offers practical benefits for policymakers and industry stakeholders. For example, insights from the analysis report—through network and factorial analyses—show how diverse academic traditions intersect, suggesting that collaboration across fields can drive innovations in both tourism experience design and well-being enhancement.

Methodological Challenges and Innovations: A recurring theme is the challenge of synthesizing a fragmented literature that spans multiple disciplines and employs varied methodologies. One of the main challenges is operationalizing subjective constructs like happiness and well-being in a standardized and comparable way. On the innovation front, the proposal advocates for a combination of bibliometric methods, qualitative content analysis, and machine-learning techniques (such as structural topic modeling) to map research trends and uncover latent intellectual structures. The analysis report further demonstrates how network analyses (co-citation, bibliographic coupling) and factorial analyses can reveal the underpinnings of tourism research. These methodological innovations not only help in capturing complex interrelations but also pave the way for more robust, data-driven evaluations of how tourism contributes to happiness.

Conclusion of the bibliometrics analysis

- The bibliometric analysis report and the research proposal collectively illuminate a maturing yet still evolving scholarly landscape. A core consensus emerges that tourism experiences do, in fact, enhance happiness, albeit through varying degrees of hedonic and eudaimonic pathways. The field's conceptual and methodological foundations rest upon well-established positive-psychology measures, although new lines of inquiry—such as sustainability, risk perception, and digital transformation—point to a broader, interdisciplinary perspective. Both documents underscore the importance of situating tourism within a more holistic, life-satisfaction context that accounts for cultural, social, and psychological complexities. The analysis confirms the proposal's argument that tourism research now recognizes human well-being as a crucial outcome of travel experiences, but it also reveals areas where research remains patchy, calling for innovative, data-driven methods and collaborative theoretical models. By uniting insights from the proposal's theoretical roadmap with the analysis report's empirical mapping, scholars and practitioners can more effectively harness tourism's potential to foster and sustain human happiness in a rapidly changing global environment.
- In conclusion, findings converge on the need for a comprehensive, integrative approach to studying the relationship between tourism and happiness. The relevant arguments call for moving beyond narrow, isolated studies toward a multidimensional framework that accounts for both immediate and

2365   lasting impacts on well-being. Future research should address the proposed questions, embrace inter-
2366   disciplinary methodologies, and overcome challenges related to data standardization and integration.
2367   Together, these efforts can deepen our understanding of tourism's transformative potential for en-
2368   hancing quality of life, guiding both academic research and practical interventions in the tourism
2369   industry.

2370 **Topic Modeling**

2371 **Preprocessing**

2372 **Optimal K**

2373 **Modeling**

2374 **Final Model Modeling**

2375 **Final Model Validation**

2376 **Effect**

2377 **Findings (Main)**

2378 **Topic Result**

2379 **Proportion**

2380 **Topic Comparision**

2381 **Topic Labeling**

2382 **Initial Label**

2383 **Update Label from User**

2384 **Additional Findings (Analysis with Covariates)**

2385 **Covariate (time)**

2386 **Covariate (Categorical)**

2387 **Covariate (Interaction Term)**

2388 **Topic Network Analysis**

2389 **LDAVIS**

2390 **Discussion of the Topic Modeling**

2391 **Relevant Arguments:**

2392 **Potential Research Questions:**

2393 **Three discussion points:**

2394 **Discussion point1**

2395 **Discussion point2**

2396 **Discussion point3**

2397 **Conclusion of the Topic Modeling**

2398 Discussion

2399 **Conclusion**

2400 **References**